THIS SIGN OF HEALING, ACTS 3:1-10

A STUDY IN LUCAN THEOLOGY

by

M. Dennis Hamm, S.J., A.B., M.A., Ph.L., M.A.

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Saint Louis
University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

1975

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Adjunct Professor Frederick W. Danker,
Chairman and Advisor

Professor Keith F. Nickle

Assistant Professor Robert F. O'Toole, S.J.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

What appeared to be a solitary task turns out to have been a community enterprise all along. I owe special thanks to a number of individuals and groups:

to the people of Merton House, whose request for a brief talk on healing in scripture four years ago inspired many of the thoughts and questions explored in this study;

to the faculty of the Yale Divinity School, for the hospitality of a research fellowship;

to my brothers in the Jesuit communities of Arrupe House, St. Louis, and Orange Street, New Haven, and to my sisters of the Dominican community, Edwards Street, New Haven--for their fellowship and support;

to Creighton University, for the fraternal encouragement of its community and for a part-time teaching arrangement which allowed me to write;

to my dissertation committee, for patient and generous attention during a period which was for each, in different ways, a time of strenuous transition; and

to Ms. Mary Waldron and Sister Mary Maxine Williams, a.s.c., for invaluable assistance in the preparation of this typescript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE. LUKE'S TREATMENT OF THE GOSPEL HEALINGS: IN SEARCH OF HIS METHOD 18

A. The Day of Healing at Caparnaum 20

- 1. The larger structure 20
- 2. The demoniac in the synagogue . . . 21
- 3. Simon's mother-in-law 23
- 4. The sick healed at evening 24
- 5. Summary on the "day" at Capernaum . . 26

B. From the First Call to the Sermon . . . 27

- 1. The arrangement 27
- 2. The cleansing of the leper 30
- 3. The healing of the paralytic 32
- 4. The call of Levi 37
- 5. The man with the withered hand . . . 38
- 6. The summary before the sermon . . . 39

C. The Rest of the Galilean Ministry . . . 42

- 1. The centurion's servant 42
- 2. The raising of the widow's son at Nain 44
- 3. The Gergesene demoniac 45
- 4. Jairus' daughter and the woman who who touched Jesus' garment 47
- 5. The mission of the Twelve 50
- 6. The feeding of the five thousand . . 52
- 7. The healing of a boy with an unclean spirit 53
- 8. The transition to the second passion prediction 54

D. Some Healing Material in the Center Section 56

- 1. The charge to the seventy-two and the woes over the Galilean cities . . . 56
- 2. The blind man of Jericho 57

XUM

E. The Healings Proper to Luke 63

1. The bent woman 64
2. The man with dropsy 73
3. The grateful Samaritan leper 81

F. A Pattern of Responses 83

1. The Galilean Ministry 84
2. The Journey to Jerusalem 85
3. The Jerusalem Events 87

G. Summary: What We Have Learned of Luke's Method 89

CHAPTER TWO. ACTS 3:1-10: THE HEALING OF THE TEMPLE BEGGAR 93

A. Notes on the Text 94

B. Historical and Literary Questions . . . 110

1. The Beautiful Gate and Solomon's Portico 110
2. The presence of John 118
3. The transformation 122
4. The "dynamic of attention" and the role of the apostles 124
5. The power of the name of Jesus versus silver and gold 125

C. Gathering the Clues 129

CHAPTER THREE. THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT 131

A. The Structure of the Context 131

1. The articulations of the larger structure 131
2. The Jerusalem story 134

B. Acts 3:1-4:31: An Editorial Unit? 138

C. Peter's Speech in Solomon's Portico . . . 141

D. Peter and John before the Council . . . 186

E. The Community Prays for Boldness 201

F. Summary 207

CHAPTER FOUR. THE SIGN'S SIGNIFICANCE WITHIN LUKE-ACTS 209

A. The Healing as Eschatological Sign . . . 210

1. A sign among 'signs and wonders' . . 210
2. A sign of the last days begun . . . 213
3. "And all who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved" 215
4. A sign of the Reign of God 218
5. A sign of the restoration of Israel . 220
6. Conclusion 223

B. The Healing as Christological Sign . . . 226

1. The Prophet-like-Moses 226
2. The latter-day Elijah? 229
3. The Anointed 234
4. *Pais* 236

C. The Healing as Ecclesiological Sign . . . 239

1. The missions as analogous 239
2. The missions as successive 248
3. The missions as identical 255

D. The Healing as a Sign of Salvation . . . 263

1. *Sōzein*: 'to heal' and 'to save' . . 264
2. The taunts under the cross 266
3. Before the council 267
4. *Sōtēria* 268
5. *Sōtēr* 271
6. Five confirming examples 272

CONCLUSION 275

A. Acts 3:1-10 and the Healing Accounts of the Third Gospel 275

B. The Healing as Symbol 278

C. Some Final Observations 281

BIBLIOGRAPHY 285

BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR 302

INTRODUCTION

It is the growing consensus of New Testament scholarship that Luke, like the other evangelists, has creatively interpreted the material which he received; that he is no mere collector of fragments of tradition but has reworked the tradition to interpret the meaning of the risen Lord for the church of his time and place; and that, moreover, the Third Gospel and Acts together form a coherent two-volume work whose theological themes have been mediated and elaborated by a single mind; in short, that Luke is in a very real sense the *author* of a two-volume work which must be read as an artistic whole.[1]

The hypothesis of the unified authorship of Luke-Acts has already been fruitfully employed along several lines--to study Luke's eschatology (as, for example, in the work of Conzelmann, Robinson, Flender, Talbert), to explicate the speeches of Acts as vehicles of Lucan theology (e. g., Wilckens, Voss, Dupont, Kränkl), to explore Luke's ecclesiology (e. g., Jervell, G. Lohfink, Zingg), and to discern the larger literary structures (e. g., P. Schubert and Talbert).[1]

---

[1] Martin Dibelius, in *Augsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, ed. H. Greeven, FRLANT N.F.42 (Göttingen, 1951); ET: *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Mary Ling (New York: Scribner's, 1956), and H. J. Cadbury, in *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), provided the seminal impulse, which, thanks especially to H. Conzelmann (see next note), has flowered recently in German scholarship. A sampler of the latter has been provided for English-speaking readers in the anthology of L. Keck and J. L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966). In France, this view of Luke-Acts has been reflected especially in the work of J. Dupont; see his *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Lectio Divina, 45 (Paris: Cerf, 1967).

---

[1] Conzelmann's *Die Mitte der Zeit* (Tübingen: 1953) [ET: *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1960)], focusing on Luke's eschatology, was one of the first studies to attempt a consistent reading of Luke the redactor. For examples of how that project has been both sustained and revised, see Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967); W. C. Robinson, *The Way of the Lord* (University of Basle dissertation, 1960); Charles H. Talbert, "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian," in G. Bornkamm et al., *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol. 1 (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), 171-222.

On the theology of the speeches, see Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 5 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963, 2nd ed); G. Voss, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzugen*, Studia Neotestamentica, 2 (Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1965); J. Dupont, "Les discours de Pierre dans les Acts et le chapitre XXIV de l'evangile de Luc," in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'Evangile de Luc: Problèmes litteraires et theologiques* [L. Cerfaux Festschrift], (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Louvaniensum Belgium: Editorio J. Duculot, S. A., Gemboux, 1973), pp. 329-74; E. Krankl, *Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesu in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, Biblische Untersuchungen, 8 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1972).

On Luke's ecclesiology, see Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972); Paul Zingg, *Das Wachsen der Kirche: Beitrage zur Frage der lukanischen Redaction und Theologie*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 3 (Freiburg/Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1974); Gerhard

Serious study of the Lucan miracle accounts, however, has only just begun (in, for example, the mainly Matthean study of Held and the dissertation of Miller).[1]

Lohfink, Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur Lukanischen Ekklesiologie, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 39 (Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1975).

On the structure of Luke-Acts, see Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in W. Eltester (ed.), Neutestamentliche Studien fur Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1954), pp. 165-86; Charles H. Talbert, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts, SBL Monograph Series, 20 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974).

[1] Heinz Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," in G. Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and H. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. by Percy Scott (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 165-299; Marvin H. Miller, "The Character of Miracles in Luke-Acts," Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, California, 1971.

At the present moment in NT scholarship, the question of miracles is being approached from a variety of perspectives. Alan Richardson, The Miracle Stories of the Gospels (New York: Harper, 1941), and Reginald Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles (Philadelphia: Westminister, 1963), deal briefly with the whole topic of Gospel miracles within the context of biblical tradition. H. van der Loos, abstracting from issues of tradition and redaction, has provided an exhaustive review of the literature on historical questions connected with the Gospel miracles, The Miracles of Jesus, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1965). Paul Achtemeier, "Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae," JBL 89 (1970): 265-291, and "The Origin and Function of the Pre-Marcan Miracle Catenae," JBL 91 (1972): 198-221, has done a careful form-critical study of the Marcan miracles. From the perspective of the history of religions, a number of studies have attempted to illuminate the NT miracle traditions by means of such categories as theios aner, aretalogy, and magic. M. Smith has restated the religionsgeschichtlich questions recently in his "Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretologies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus," JBL 90(1971): 174-199. Paul

The present study concentrates on a single Lucan healing account, Acts 3:1-10, and uses the total context of Luke-Acts as the primary tool of exegesis.

Among all the healings in Luke-Acts, it is the healing of the temple-gate beggar which Luke surrounds with the fullest interpretive context. Although the healing ministries of Jesus and the disciples do receive some summary interpretation, e. g., in the sayings of Jesus (see Lk 10:9,13; 11:20; 13:32) and in the speeches of Peter (Acts 2:22 and 10:38), this particular

---

Achtemeier reviews the data in "Gospel Miracle Tradition and the Divine Man," Interpretation 26 (April, 1972): 174-197. John M. Hull finds the synoptic gospels influenced in various ways--Matthew least, Luke most--by the Hellenistic myth of the magus, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, 28 (Napierville, Ill.; SCM Press, 1974). Howard Kee, "Aretalogy and Gospel," JBL 92 (1973): 402-422, challenges a basic assumption behind aretalogy/gospel discussions, namely that there existed in Hellenistic times a fixed genre or aretalogy. David L. Tiede, The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker, SBL Dissertation Series, 1 (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), raises questions about another assumption, i. e., that a unified and universal image of theios aner existed in the ancient world.

The present study will neither rehearse nor further explore these questions. The focus here is neither historical nor religionsgeschichtlich, but literary and theological. Granted that the former two foci can be tools for the latter, it is also possible and useful to focus on the literary structure itself. This study is informed by the conviction that the fifty-two chapter text of Luke-Acts itself offers many clues to its meaning which have been overlooked. If the text itself is used here as the primary tool, it is for that reason and not because of any cavalier dismissal of the questions raised from the perspective of the history of religions.

healing at the beginning of the post-Pentecost ministry of Peter receives the greatest attention within the flow of the narrative. Like the sights and sounds of the Pentecost miracle, the cure of the temple cripple becomes the subject of an interpretive speech by Peter to the people (Acts 2:12-26) and of yet another speech to the leaders (Acts 4:8ff). Indeed, not only is the healing the occasion of the speech, but the healed man's physical presence (Acts 3:11; 4:10,14) is a dramatic part of the narrative and becomes, as it were, part of the dialogue. The prayer of the community (Acts 4:24-30) is, in turn, triggered by the response of the Jerusalem officials to the healing, and the content of the prayer is a petition of God's continued support through further gifts of "signs and wonders," which in this context are healing and bold preaching.

The possibility that Luke intends the elements of the healing, the speeches, and the prayer to be considered as a unit is suggested by his placing that material (3:1-4:31) within the framework of the first two major summaries about community life (2:43-47 and 4:32-37). If Luke-Acts is truly a coherent work, then here, surely, is a passage which deserves to be studied from the perspective of composition criticism.[1]

---

[1] Most commentators treat the temple healing and the following speeches as somehow related. For example,

XUM

An hypothesis to be tested in this study is that Luke employs the healing stories symbolically, in the service of his theology. That is, without in any way denigrating the historicity of the healing ministries of Jesus and the disciples, the evangelist uses the traditional stories about these healings in a symbolic way, so that they become paradigms of the relationship between the believer and the risen Lord.[1]

---

the following all treat Acts 3:1-4:31 as a coherent subsection of Acts: Wellhausen, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte (Berlin: Weidmarnische Buchhandlung, 1914), p. 7; Bauernfeind, Die Apostelgeschichte, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, 5 (Leipzig: 1939), p. 102; and J. Schmitt, "L'eglise de Jerusalem, ou la 'restauration' d'Israel," Revue des sciences religieuses 27 (1953): 212. And scholars pursuing the question of sources for Acts have typically identified Acts 3:1-4:31 as part (or the whole) of a source. For R. Schütz, it was Acts 1-5. For E. Zeller (1854), 2:42-4:31. For Harnack, 3:1-5:61 was the "good" Jerusalem Source A ("eine folgerechte, in sich geschlossene geschichtliche Darstellung"--Die Apostelgeschichte [Leipzig: J. C. Hinricks, 1908], p. 144). For Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, it is 3:1-4:35 (The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, 5 vols [London: Macmillan & Co., 1920-1933], vol. 2, in loc.). For Lucien Cerfaux, Acts 2:41-5:42 provides "une documentation concrete" of the primitive community of Jerusalem ("La première communauté chretienne à Jerusalem," ETL 16 (1939): 31.) Quite apart from the validity of these various source hypotheses, they attest to the way that 3:1-4:31 lends itself to be read as a unity. This study shall both presume and test that apparent unity. [For a good review of the source question in Acts, see J. Dupont, The sources of the Acts, trans., K. Pond (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).]

[1] With respect to the miracles in Acts, G. W. H. Lampe articulates, but does not develop, this hypothesis when he says: "It is reasonable to hold that in all

(Indeed, it is quite possible to extend the hypothesis to the pregospel tradition and conjecture that the narratives about Jesus' healings were never mere reminiscences but were, from Easter on, used by the church as teaching tools for catechesis about Christian life.)[1]

To state provisionally the interpretation which this study attempts to demonstrate: within the

---

cases alike Luke believed that the miracles which he recorded were concrete historical events, but that their parabolic significance was such as to entitle him to arrange them in his story, furnish them as it might be appropriate with explanatory speeches, and write them up in the light of parallels both in the Old Testament and in the ministry of Jesus." "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles" in C. F. D. Moule (ed.), Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1965), p. 173.

Similarly, F. Bovon, in "Le salut dans les ecrits de Luc. Essai," Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie 23 (1973): 303, reviewing Luke's use of sōzein and its cognates for physical rescue, observes that "les cas de salut physique ont une fonction symbolique: ils illustrent le salut eternel que Luc est contraint, faute de mieux, de raconter sur le mode historique et par voie analogique."

[1] A case can be made that other evangelists, too, use the healing traditions symbolically. The healings from blindness appear to have been especially suggestive in this respect. For a recent discussion of the Bartimaeus cure as paradigm of discipleship, see Karl-Georg Replch, Markus: Lehrer der Gemeinde (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), esp. pp. 222ff. For a representative discussion of the symbolic dimension of the healing of the man born blind (Jn 9), see Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel according to John, Anchor Bible, 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966), in loc. The symbolic aspect of the Johannine healings is treated with particular sensitivity by John Marsh, Saint John, The Pelican Gospel Commentaries (London: Penguin Books, 1968).

full context of Luke-Acts, the author presents the healing of the man at the Beautiful Gate (Acts 3:1-10) as an emblem (or parable, or symbol, or 'acting out') of the "restoration of Israel"--a paradigm[1] of the saving action of God in this age of the missionary church, which is an extension of the time of fulfilment begun in the public ministry of Jesus.

Commentators have recognized the connection between the healing and the speeches of Acts 3-4. Some have even begun to probe its symbolic dimensions.[2]

---

[1] The word "paradigm" is not used here in the sense in which Dibelius used it as one of his form-critical categories, i. e., a story about Jesus used as an exemplum in early Christian preaching (see From Tradition to Gospel [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935], passim). The narrative may well have been used that way. But in this study, which does not explore the question of possible preliterary usage, the word "paradigm" will mean simply pattern or model.

[2] Lampe ("Miracles," p. 171), for example, observes "[Luke's] stories are stylized. They are impressionistic in the sense that they are signs in which the entire meaning of the gospel and its effect on its hearers, whether for acceptance or rejection, are, as it were, crystallized or embodied in a few dramatic episodes. The healing of the lame man at the temple gate, with its accompanying discourse, is the point at which the entire proclamation of the gospel to the leaders of Israel in the holy city of Jerusalem finds its focus. So, too, when we read of Peter healing the paralyzed and raising the dead, we are inclined to ask, as we do of the stories in the gospels, whether these are dramatic signs and representations of a deeper and wider reality: whether they signify the kind of healing and resurrection, when he says that God has made us alive with Christ when we were dead in trespasses and raised us up and made us to sit in the heavenlies in Jesus Christ."

Curiously, M. D. Goulder, in a study which

Hastings Robinson, for example, calls the temple cripple "an apt emblem of the Jewish nation surrounded as they were with many of the external glories of their dispensation, yet without any spiritual strength."[1] B. T. Bard describes the story of the cripple as "ein Abbild von der Wiederherstellung Israels" (an image of the restoration of Israel) and spends several paragraphs of his commentary beginning to unfold that insight.[2] And homiletic and spiritual writers have

---

understands much in Acts as symbolic and typological construction, judges the healing of the temple cripple to be probably factual and *therefore* not symbolic. He thereby asserts a disjunction between history and symbol which is by no means presumed in the present study. It is thoroughly possible to see symbolic meaning in a factual event. While our study does not address the question of historicity, the discussion of the narrative by no means denies it historicity. [The Goulder reference is *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), p. 188.]

[1] Hastings Robinson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: John W. Parker, 1939), in loc.

[2] Among the commentators on Acts, Bard is the only one I have found who has made more than a passing suggestion that the temple beggar symbolizes Israel. According to Bard, Israel is like the cripple in the following points: from the moment of her spiritual birth (during the exodus), she was spiritually lame, unable to walk in the laws of the Lord; this impotence was manifested most vividly during the forty years of rebellion in the wilderness when they were excluded from the promised land. The healing, then, is an image of the coming restoration of Israel. "As the life of the Risen Christ flows in the body of the lame man (Acts 4:9-10), so will lame Israel experience a spiritual and national resurrection through Jesus of Nazareth, its crucified and risen messiah. It will be 'a people born in one moment' (Is 66:8) which means 'life from the dead' (Rom 11:15)." B. T. Bard, *Apostelgeschichte*

XUM

frequently made symbolic applications of this healing.[1] But there has not yet appeared a thorough study of the symbolic dimensions of Acts 3:1-10 as revealed in the context of Luke-Acts itself.

How precisely this healing functions within the thematic structure of his theology and to what extent the healing is used symbolically--these things must be searched out and demonstrated from the text of Luke-Acts itself. The procedure of this study will be first (chapter one) to analyze Luke's handling of the healing accounts in his gospel, reviewing briefly the common synoptic healings (the triple tradition), then studying in greater detail the function of the healings proper to the Third Gospel (the bent woman, the man with dropsy, and the ten lepers). Having thus determined something of Luke's special interests and editorial method, it will be possible to analyze more fully his presentation of the healing of the temple beggar in Acts. To that end, chapter two will be devoted to a close study of Acts 3:1-10. Chapter three will explore the

---

(Erzhausen: Leuchter-Verlag GmbH., 1966), pp. 64f. What Bard expresses briefly and with little elaboration, this study proposes to demonstrate from the text in some depth.

[1] See Paul Jaggi, Was Ich aber habe, das gebe ich dir: Eine Deutung der Heilung des Lahmen vor der schone Tempelpforte nach Apostelgeschichte 3 und 4 (Bern: Christliches Verlagshaus, 1953), which it not an exegesis but a 68-page sermon.

immediate interpretive context--the speeches and prayer of Acts 3:12-4:31. Finally, chapter four will examine the relation of "this sign of healing" to major themes of Luke-Acts.

What this study attempts regarding the Lucan healing accounts may be compared with emphases in recent parable research. It is well known that the interpretation of the parables has had a varied history. It has moved from the elaborate allegorizing of the Fathers (e. g., Augustine and Origen), to a search for the main point (Jülicher, who reduced parables to moral lessons), to a quest for the words of Jesus which underlie the church's retelling (Jeremias, Dodd, and Perrin, who helped recover the parables' eschatological perspective), and then to a closer look at the evangelists' redactional use of the parables (e. g., Kingsbury, Topel, and Carlston).[1] In general it may be said that the movement in recent parable scholarship has been from rediscovering the teaching of Jesus to rediscovering the teaching of the evangelists.[1] Granting the obvious phenomenological difference between parables told and healings done, the healing accounts have been subject to the same shifting fashions of criticism as the parables. Just as, in one's quest for the historical Jesus, one can search for the *ipsissima verba*, so one can seek out the *ipsissima facta*. Approaching the healings from this point of view, one inquires into such questions as what it meant to attribute pathological symptoms to demonic forces, what constituted leprosy in those days, how the faith that saved during the earthly ministry of Jesus is to be compared with the post-Easter faith of Christians, how the exorcisms of Jesus differed from the practices of other contemporary Jewish exorcists (of whose very existence we learn from a saying of Jesus).[2] Although the clues for answers to

---

[1] Adolph Jülicher, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesselschaft, 1963; a reprint of the 1910 Tübingen edition; orig. pub. 1888-89); J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke from 6th Ger ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963); Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (New York: Harper and Row, 1967); Jack Dean Kingsbury, The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13 (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1969); L. John Topel, "Acquittal: A Redaction-critical Study of Lk 12:57-59," Ph. D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1973; Charles E. Carlston, The Parables of the Triple Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975). [This brief scanning of parable interpretation is admittedly oversimplified. In highlighting the switch from form-criticism to redaction-criticism, I have

---

neglected to mention the important group of current scholars who focus on the parables as literary structures, e. g., Robert Funk, Dominic Crossan, Dan O. Via, and Amos Wilder.]

[1] Joachim Rohde's survey, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), shows how such studies have been far more interested in the redaction of the sayings than in the reworking of the narratives.

[2] For one attempt to answer this last question, see Vernon McCasland, *By the Finger of God: Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light of Modern Views of Mental Illness* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1951).

such questions are scarce, the attempt itself has been heuristically valuable. Like the pursuit of the *ipsissima verba*, the search for the *ipsissima facta* has led finally to the recognition that the biblical data give us something else: not information simply about what Jesus of Nazareth did *in illo tempore*, but the church's understanding of those actions as reflecting what the risen Lord does now.

Just as the early church used the Old Testament to interpret the actions of Jesus, so, it appears, they used the memories about Jesus to interpret their present relationship to the risen Lord. It follows, then, that just as the community's understanding of the parables *after* Easter may be more important than what they may have meant to listeners before Easter, similarly the church's understanding of the healing actions of Jesus after Easter may be more important than our reconstructions of Jesus' pre-Easter healing ministry.

Moreover, even our conjectures about the church's understanding of the healings, as this understanding developed in the tradition up to the time of the formation of the gospels, remain always a matter of guesswork. We do, however, have data for studying how the evangelists understood those healings (which understanding is, after all, the one canonized by the church as the authentic).

XUM

At this moment, when we are beginning to see the implications of taking seriously the creative authorship of the evangelists, the time is ripe, it would seem, for studying the healing accounts in their gospel setting. Among the Lucan healings, that of the temple beggar (Acts 3:1-10) has been chosen as providing the most fully developed example of Luke's use of the healing tradition.

A Preliminary Questioning of the Passage

Since chapter one, the survey of Luke's retelling of the gospel healings, is intended as a preparation for analyzing Acts 3:1-10 (a task delayed until chapters two and three), it will be well to give the primary text a preliminary reading--to hear the story straight through and then to ask some basic questions. The RSV translation renders the Greek faithfully.

> [1]Now Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour. [2]And a man lame from birth was being carried, whom they laid daily at that gate of the temple which is called Beautiful to ask alms of those who entered the temple. [3]Seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple, he asked for alms. [4]And Peter directed his gaze at him, with John, and said, "Look at us." [5]And he fixed his attention upon them, expecting to receive something from them. [6]But Peter said, "I have no silver and gold, but I give you what I have; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk." [7]And he took him by the right hand and raised him up; and immediately his feet and ankles were made strong.[8]And leaping up he stood and walked and entered the temple with them,

> walking and leaping and praising God. [9]And all the people saw him walking and praising God, [10]and recognized him as the one who sat for alms at the Beautiful Gate of the temple; and they were filled with wonder and amazement at what had happened to him.

Much is made of the temple setting. It is mentioned six times in a ten-verse story. Is this detail incidental or significant?

There is a curious "dynamic of attention" going on here--people seeing (vv. 3 and 9), directing their gaze (v. 4), commanding attention (v. 4), fixing attention (v. 5), and recognizing (v. 10). And see the reference to staring at v. 12. Is this behavior just a narrative mannerism, or is it a purposeful feature of the story?

In such a brief narrative, the repetition in the description of the healed man's behavior is remarkable. His leaping, walking, and praising God are each referred to twice, with rare Greek words behind the translation "leaping up" (*exallomenos*) and "leaping" (*hallomenos*). Is this to be understood simply as Luke's way of dramatizing the cure, or is there more to it than that?

In the speech that follows, Peter says, "God . . . has glorified his son/servant (*pais*) . . . (3:13). Is this said with reference to the healing, or is it solely another proclamation of the resurrection?

XUM

Later on in that speech, Peter says, "And his name, by faith in his name, has made this man strong whom you see and know: and the faith which is through him [RSV: Jesus] has given the man this perfect health in the presence of you all" (3:16). Whose faith is spoken of here? Does the narrative provide the answer? Or does the answer lie within the interpretive speech?

At the inquest (4:5-22), the brief speech of Peter (vv. 8-12) employs "saving" vocabulary in a remarkable way. First he announces that the cripple has been healed (*sesō$_{i}$stai*, v. 9) in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth; then he moves on to say that there is salvation (*sōtēria*) in no one else, "for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (*dei sōthēnai*, v. 12)--the same word as the one translated "healed" in verse 9. This play on the Greek words for healing, saving, and salvation seems to present the healing of Acts 3:1-10 as a sign of a divine saving power which effects more than physical healing. What prompts this seeming leap from single physical event to broad religious interpretation? Is this happening on the level of Peter, of the tradition, or of Luke?

These, ultimately, are questions relating to the aim of the author. Although it would be possible to hazard guesses on the basis of the immediate context,

XUM

it seems more appropriate, first, to examine the Third Gospel--volume one of Luke-Acts--to see what can be learned there about Luke's use of the healing traditions. This should provide some control when we return to assess Luke's intention in Acts 3.

CHAPTER ONE

LUKE'S TREATMENT OF THE GOSPEL HEALINGS: IN SEARCH OF HIS METHOD

The aim of this chapter will be to learn what we can of Luke's editorial method by surveying his handling of the healing material[1] in the Third Gospel. Where he uses tradition in common with the other synoptists (the "triple tradition"), we will read Luke's version as a redaction of Mark's. Where he uses material in common with Matthew alone (the "double tradition" or "Q"), we will ask what a comparison between the two reveals about Luke's interest. Since our primary concern will be composition criticism (looking for the design within the whole of the interpreted material) rather than redaction criticism strictly speaking (focusing on hypothetical changes of a Marcan or other Vorlage), our interest will center less on what we can guess regarding Luke's changes of prior tradition and more on that pattern within Luke-Acts as a two-volume whole. We shall be especially attentive, then, to patterns of word choice, narrative, and arrangement which appear to be thematic to Luke-Acts. The larger editorial setting of the healing accounts will be a special concern. For this reason we will focus on the Lucan handling of three healings in particular--the bent woman, the dropsical man, and the ten lepers. For these three healings, besides being proper to Luke, all appear in the central section of his gospel, the place where it would seem that Luke as author has the greatest freedom in shaping the editorial setting of the healings.[1]

---

[1] The Third Gospel, apart from the healings mentioned globally in the summaries, presents 18 healings. Of the 13 Marcan healings, Luke drops 3 (as part of the "great omission"), tells two in common with Matthew (labeled arbitrarily "Q")--the centurion's boy and the dumb demoniac--and has six peculiar to himself: Zechariah's dumbness, the widow of Nain's son, the bent woman, the dropsical man, the ten lepers, and the ear of the high priest's slave. (Although it is not commonly thought of this way, the curing of Elizabeth's sterility might well be considered the first healing in Luke.)

---

[1] The assertion that Luke has greater freedom in the center section is based on an assumption deriving from the two-source theory: that Luke here departs from the Marcan framework and arranges the material of the travel narrative according to his own design. That the arrangement of the central section is a Lucan construction is strongly suggested by recent studies in the editing of this material.

For two provocative discussions of this section of Luke, see W. C. Robinson, "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative (9:51ff.)," JBL 79 (1960):20-31 and C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel" in Nineham, ed., Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot (Oxford: 1957), especially pp. 42-50.

XUM

A. The Day of Healing at Capernaum

1. The Larger Structure

Luke keeps intact the "day" of healing which Mark presents near the beginning of his gospel (Mk 1:21-34)--the demoniac in the synagogue, Simon's mother-in-law, the sick healed at evening, and moving on the next morning.[1] But the context of this material is quite different in that Luke frames it with two of his major editorial transpositions--the pericope of the rejection at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-30, which he moves back from Mk 6:1-6 to a position almost immediately after the temptations and expands it with the thematic application of Is 61) and his version of the call of the first disciples (5:1-11, which he moves forward from the Marcan position, Mk 1:16-20, where Mark has it just before this day of healing). The upshot is that whereas the Marcan Jesus moves through that initial day of healing accompanied by those four disciples (all four are present in Simon's house, 1:30, and they come looking for him next morning in the lonely place, 1:34), the Lucan Jesus moves through that day very much on his own. The disciples are not named as present in Simon's house (Lk 4:38),[1] and it is the people (*hoi ochloi*), not the disciples, who come looking for him next morning (4:42). In both the Second and Third Gospels, Jesus moves through that day as master, but in Luke the master begins his healing ministry affirmed by God but rejected by his own (4:28f). In presenting Jesus as beginning with the dynamic of mission-following-upon-rejection, Luke may have intended to establish a pattern which will be typical of the life of Jesus as a whole and the mission of the church as portrayed in Acts--a pattern which includes being sent (4:18, 43) and preaching in the synagogues (4:16ff, 44). And by placing the first call after this material, Luke has Jesus doing first alone what the disciples will repeat in their own time, particularly in Acts. Now we shall examine the ways in which the author shows his hand in the retelling of these healing stories.

---

[1] Matthew omits the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue and puts the cure of Simon's mother-in-law and the evening of healings among the miracles following the sermon on the mount.

2. The Demoniac in the Synagogue (Lk 4:31-37)[2]

Luke presents this account essentially as it stands in the Marcan version. The following adjustments, though minor, are listed because they turn out to be characteristic of the author.

---

[1] The people who comprise the subject of *ērōtēsan auton* are not specified in Luke. There is no clue in his narrative that they might include Andrew, James, and John.

[2] Although Aland sets apart 4:31f (because parallels are present in Mt 4:13; 7:28f and Jn 2:12 and 7:46?), we include these verses as part of the story in Luke.

polin tes Galilaias (v. 31): this may be an explanation for the Gentile reader but it may be simply Luke's typical inclusion at the start, of a detail mentioned later in Mark's version.[1]

V. 32: Luke omits Mark's denigration of the scribes (a typical softening of "anti-Jewish" features), and where Mark has "he taught them as one who had authority," Luke says his *logos* was with authority. Through this redaction, together with his use of *tis ho logos houtos* (v. 36) for the Marcan *didachē kainē*, Luke unites even more forcefully the fusion of word and work already present in Mark's version, i. e., more smoothly than Mark's *didachē*, Luke's *logos* refers to both the word of teaching and the command of exorcism.

V. 33: *phōnē*$_i$ *megalē*$_i$ here again Luke inserts earlier a detail that occurs later in Mark (1:26).

eis to meson: a favorite detail of Luke's; see, for example, Lk 2:46 (the child in the temple), 5:19 (the lowering of the paralytic), and 6:8 (the man with the withered hand)--one way Luke emphasizes the public nature of a healing (see also Acts 4:7) and Jesus' ministry generally (Lk 22:37; 24:36; Acts 2:22).

---

[1] Cf. Lk 6:7 (Pharisees and scribes) and 8:42 (the age of the girl).

kai dynamei: "With authority *and power* he orders . . . .": Luke introduces here a word already used thematically in his gospel (see 1:17, 35; 4:14) and destines for further use (see, for example, 5:17 and 6:19).

V. 37: "*ēchos* about him spread everywhere in that region": in the three other places where the word occurs in the NT, *ēchos* means a very powerful sound; see Lk 21:25 (where it is the perplexing roar of the eschatological sea and waves), Acts 2:2 (where it is the great Pentecostal wind-like sound), and Heb 12:19 (where it is the sound of an apocalyptic trumpet).

3. Simon's mother-in-law (Lk 4:38f)

Since, in Luke's narrative, the first disciples have yet to be called, Jesus enters Simon's house alone[1] and, where Mark has him curing the woman by a wordless gesture, Luke presents the event under the aspect of another exorcism: in a gestureless word, Jesus rebukes (*epetimēsen*, v. 39) the fever just as he did the unclean spirit a moment before (v. 35). In this context, *aphēken autēn ho pyretos* of Mk 1:31 (which, there, conveys simply the impression of relief from the symptom) takes on in

---

[1] As indicated above, the inhabitants of the house (*autois* in v. 39) remain anonymous within Luke's story line. Matthew (8:14f) has transformed the story even more radically in this direction; there no spectators are mentioned at all.

XUM

Luke the aspect of a demonic departure. In this way, the authority and power of Jesus' logos (along with the unity of word and work), heightened by Luke's redaction of the previous pericope, is highlighted still further.

4. The Sick Healed at Evening (Lk 4:40f)

Jesus is said to heal all through the laying on of hands; here we find the physical contact omitted in the previous story--an example of Luke's proclivity for employing in another place a detail suppressed elsewhere.[1]

With respect to the demons, Luke says again that Jesus rebuked (epetimēsen) them; through the triple repetition of that word (vv. 35,39,41), Luke binds the whole day's work as a manifestation of the power of his word.

Luke's version, however, allows the demons first to cry out the confession, "You are the Son of God," and then explains that Jesus rebuked them "because they knew

---

[1] For example, Luke passes over the Marcan summary about preaching the basileia tou theou right after the baptism (Mk 1:15) but introduces it at the end of the Capernaum section (Lk 4:43). He omits the cursing of the fig tree of Mk 11:12-14,20f, but includes a parable about a fig tree, which makes the same point, at Lk 13:6-9. Lk 22 lacks the anointing of the feet at Bethany (Mk 14:3ff) but provides a similar incident at 7:36ff. And the Lucan passion omits the charge about destroying the temple (Mk 14:55-60 and 15:29f) but records a similar charge at Acts 6:13f.

XUM

that he was ho Christos." The explicit use of these two titles at this point enables Luke to round off this inaugural day of healing in a way that relates it to the development of the whole narrative of the gospel thus far, especially from 3:15 on. For, in his presentation of the baptism through the day of healing, Luke has been preoccupied with the identity of Jesus as huios tou theou and ho Christos.[1] Immediately preceding the baptism, John's preaching about the one to come is introduced by the note that the people were speculating whether John were ho Christos (3:15). After the baptism, the voice from heaven proclaims him huios (3:22). And then, by placing immediately afterwards the genealogy which works backwards from Joseph through Adam to God, Luke shows that Jesus is huios (3:23) . . . tou theou (3:38) in a way that is very much tied in with the total human family. In the story of the temptations which follows, it is precisely as Son of God that Jesus is approached and tested. In Luke's expanded version of the crisis at Nazareth, the use of Is 61:1-2; 58:6 can be understood as a further interpretation of Jesus' experience at the Jordan[1] (much as the quote from Joel in Peter's speech in Acts 2 interprets the Spirit baptism of the community). Further, it would seem that Luke means the use of the echrisen of Is 61 at 4:18 to be an interpretation of the title ho Christos.[2]

---

[1] See Acts 9:20,22, where Paul's Damascus preaching is summarized as proclaiming Jesus under the same two titles.

Finally, in his description of Jesus' departure from Capernaum, Luke further integrates this healing material with what has gone before by describing the continuation of his mission in language recalling the Isaian quote of the inaugural address at Nazareth (Lk 4:43): "I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God (euangelisasthai me dei tēn basileian tou theou) to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose (hoti epi touto apestalēn; cf. Mk 1:38 eis touto gar exēlthon)."

5. Summary on the "day" at Capernaum

The union of word and work is reinforced by means of logos as 4:36, the heightening of the rebuke motif (4:35,39,41), and characterizing a day of healing as "preaching the good news of the kingdom of God" (4:43). By reframing the day with the rejection at Nazareth and the call of Simon et al., he presents Jesus as proceeding alone before initiating the work of his disciples. The use of the Isaiah quote at the start (with its echrisen at 4:18) and the titles "Son of God" and "the Christ" (4:41) added to the demonic confession towards the end, heighten the christological meaning of the Lucan day at Capernaum. So we find already that Luke can treat a tradition with great restraint and respect, and yet, with a few strokes, dramatically refocus it.

---

[1] For a recent discussion on this point, see Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 129 and 170.

[2] See Acts 4:27, where the pesher interpretation of ho Christos in Ps 2:2 is taken etymologically: hon echrisen. See, too, Acts 10:36,38.

B. From the First Call to the Sermon (Lk 5:1-6:20a)

1. The Arrangement

A look at the gross anatomy of Luke's arrangement of the next body of material--the call of the first disciples up to the sermon on the plain[1] reveals that Luke relates the pericopes about the disciples to the other narrative material in a way that differs from Mark, a way that may be more than a random shift. It will be noticed that the sequence of the healing stories, from the demoniac in the Capernaum synagogue to the man with the withered hand, is identical with Mark's. But the Lucan arrangement does differ because of some changes he makes in material concerning the disciples--the placement of the first call between the Capernaum "day" and the healing of the leper and, at the other end, the reversal, at Lk 6:12-19, of the Marcan sequence of healing summary and then the call of the twelve.

---

[1] For convenience we shall use the conventional label, though Heinz Schürmann makes an important point when he calls it the Predigt am Berge inasmuch as Jesus' having come down from the mountain, like Moses, is surely not without significance to Luke. H. Schurmann, Das Lukasevangelium, Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1, 1-9, 50, Band III, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), in loc.

We have already surmised Luke's reason for postponing the first call story (so that Jesus can begin alone). Now it must be asked, Why does he put that call story here, between the summary of the mission "in all the synagogues of Judea" (4:44) and the cure of the leper? It would seem that it had to go there. Having been postponed, the call story had to be told soon because the call of Levi was coming up (and it would have been inappropriate to narrate that incident before the call of Simon, James, and John); moreover, they were needed on the scene for the question about fasting (5:33ff) and the grain plucking incident (6:1-5). Given this situation, placement between the mission summary and the leper story was inevitable; the summary was a natural rounding off of what had gone before and the

XUM

leper's cure could easily be made a part of the cycle of stories which follow. To be sure, it is not, like the other five pericopes which follows, a *Streitgespräch*, but Jesus' act of touching the leper is surely a challenge to legalism. That Luke seems to be aware that he is joining the leper story more closely with what follows is indicated by his removal of the Marcan transitional note about returning to Capernaum (Mk 2:1).[1] And whether it was intended or not, the placement of Luke's version of the first call, in the midst of two units of healing stories, is most appropriate. For the word which is used to describe Simon's mission is *zōgrōn* (5:10). *Zōgreō* has more to do with war than fishing, and more to do with life than death. It is employed in the LXX to mean "take alive" in contexts of *herem* (see Num 31:15,18; Dt 20:16; Jos 2:13; 6:25; 9:26; 2 Sam 8:2; 2 Ch 25:12). To the Hellenistic ear the *zō* root would suggest more of life-saving than capture. If indeed that is the thrust of the word, then the appropriateness of narrating a call to such activity in the midst of the lifegiving accounts of healing becomes obvious.

---

[1] It might be suggested that Jesus does not return to a town in Luke, but in fact we find him in Capernaum again at Lk 7:1.

XUM

The discussion of Luke's inversion of the Marcan order at Lk 6:12-19 will be taken up in its place in the sequence.

2. The Cleansing of the Leper

en mia$_i$ tōn poleōn (5:12): It is problematic whether lepers were even allowed to wander freely within a town and it is possible that Luke did not know about this. If the author added this topographic note to his introductory verse, it may well have been his way of providing continuity with 4:43 (*kai tais heterais polesin . . .*); here, with the leper story, that ministry is resumed.

Luke tones down Jesus' emotional involvement (and enhances his authority?) through the deletion of *splanchnistheis* (Mk 1:41)[1] and *embrimēsamenos* (Mk 1:43), and he saves the leper from the scandal of disobedience by saying that the *logos peri autou* circulated, without saying with whose help. But it is the response at the end which is most suggestive regarding Luke's treatment of this healing. "Great crowds gathered to hear and be healed of their infirmities" (5:15). If the treatment of the Capernaum day of healing implied a union between

---

[1] Although *splanchnistheis* has the greatest variety of textual witnesses (e.g., S A B C K), it is not certain that the more difficult reading, *orgitheis* is to be rejected. See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), pp. 76f.

XUM

word and work in the preaching and healing of Jesus, here that unity is made explicit.

V. 5:16: "And he withdrew to the wilderness and prayed." It is conventional to observe that Luke adds instances of Jesus' solitary prayer (see 6:12; 9:18,28; 11:1). But Luke has precisely refrained from taking such an opportunity at just the point where Mark has provided it--Mk 1:35b, where Luke drops the prayer and says simply that Jesus withdrew to a lonely place (Lk 4:42). In speaking of Jesus' prayer after the healing of the leper, Luke may simply be restoring in one place what he removed in another, a not untypical procedure of his (see n. 1, p. 24), but even if that is true, it bespeaks a deliberateness of composition which deserves a closer look. Luke first introduces Jesus at prayer at the baptism scene, when he experienced the descent of the Holy Spirit and the voice from heaven (Lk 3:21, where Luke differs in this matter from the synoptic parallels). Then, led by the Spirit, Jesus proceeds to the wilderness, whence he returns "in the power of the Spirit" (4:14) to proclaim himself as the anointed one of Is 61 and, further, to demonstrate the significance of the mission in the day of healing at Capernaum. Luke omits the Marcan note of prayer at the end of this day possibly because he is moving on (not just withdrawing) but also because of what is to follow immediately: the initial call of Simon and the Zebedees does not warrant so rigorous a preparation (as the appointing of the Twelve, on the other hand, will). Now, in our passage (5:16), we find Jesus withdrawing to the wilderness in a protracted way (the periphrastic *ēn hypochōrōn . . . kai proseuchomenos* is used here). Then, in the healing narrative which follows, it is said that the "power (*dynamis*) of the Lord was with him to heal" (5:17). Inasmuch as the special Lucan note of withdrawal for prayer precedes key moments in the Third Gospel (the temptations, the appointment of the Twelve, the confession of Peter, and transfiguration, the discourse on prayer), it is reasonable to conclude that Luke means to highlight the action which is to follow this return in power from prayer--the healing of the paralyzed man and the encounter with hostile forces.

3. The Healing of the Paralytic (Lk 5:17-26)

Luke 5:17 revises Mk 2:1 in a variety of ways. No longer a return to the "home town" of Capernaum, this moment is now an extension of a growing mission. The expansion after the healing of the leper has already indicated that the report of Jesus has spread about and that *ochloi polloi* gathered to hear him and be healed (cf. Lk. 5:15 with Mk 1:45). And now the healing of the paralytic is prepared for by an equally expansive setting. Pharisees (here mentioned for the first time in Luke[1] and teachers of the law (nomodidaskaloi),[2] "who

---

[1] In the 27 references to Pharisees in the Third Gospel (cf. 12x in Mk), it is redactional 17x. Luke's first use of the term occurs in his setting, at 5:17, for the healing of the paralytic. With this stroke, he unifies more firmly the Streitgespräch cluster already found as a bundle in Mark (now all five stories are encounters with Pharisees). 5:21 is another reference to them in the same story. The next four instances are taken over from the Marcan controversies. Lk 6:7 heightens Mk 3:6 by identifying the adversaries at the outset, and, at the same time, Lk 6:11 softens the picture of Mk 3:6; whereas in Mk 3:6 they take counsel how to kill him; in Lk 6:11 they simply discuss what to do. The next five references (7:30,36,36,37,39) occur in the story of the pardon of the sinful woman (possibly a Lucan construction using ingredients from Mk 2 [Jesus forgiving in the presence of adversaries] and Mk 12 [Jesus anointed by a woman, omitted at this point by Luke]). Luke 11:37f is another Lucan creation of a dinner setting, here mirroring material omitted at Mk 7:1f. Lk 11:39,42,43 is Q material, paralleling the woes found in Mt 23. Lk 11:53 is the redaction closing that section. Lk 12:1 presents what was omitted at Mk 8:14 (in the great omission). The remaining nine instances of Pharisees in Luke are 13:31, 14:1,3 (a supper scene again); 15:2 (murmuring at Jesus' table fellowship; cf. 5:30); 16:14 (philargyroi); 17:20; 18:10,11 and 19:39 (rebuke your disciples). The Pharisees are not mentioned in the Jerusalem section. Indeed, where Mk 12:13 has the Pharisees and Herodians trying to catch Jesus with the tax question, in Luke 20:20 it is the hirelings of the scribes and high priests.

The Pharisees are mentioned 8x in Acts. The references there allude to them either positively or neutrally as a sect--designating Gamaliel (5:34), naming the circumcision party (15:5), holding the doctrine of resurrection against the Sadducees (23:6,6,7,8,9), or giving Paul's background (26:5).

Thus, in the Third Gospel the portrait of the Pharisees is ambiguous (Luke softens their opposition in several places; cf. Lk 6:11 with Mk 3:6; and Lk 20:20 with Mk 12:13; but he appears to heighten their opposition in many of the other instances mentioned in the first paragraph of this note); whereas in Acts, they are neutralized or even, as opponents of the anti-had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem" are there. Luke has packed the house with representatives from all Israel. Fortifying the representative nature of this introductory verse is the description of Jesus as *didaskōn* and as having the power of the Lord with him to heal (the word and work of teaching and healing brought into conjunction again).

The revising hand is also visible in the ending of the account. Where Mark has "And he rose (*ēgerthē*) and immediately (*euthys*) taking up his pallet, he went out (*exēlthen*) before them all (*emprosthen pantōn*)," Luke uses an almost entirely different set of words to say, "and immediately getting up before them, and taking up what he had been lying upon (*kai parachrēma anastas enōpion autōn aras eph' ho katekeito*), he left for home praising God." This wording associates the suddenness[1] with the cure but puts the syntactical

---

resurrectionist Sadducees, allied with the Christians. Indeed, one might say that for Luke in Acts, the Christians are the true Pharisees. See especially Acts 26:4-8.

[2] A word that turns up one other time in Luke's work--Acts 5:34, where Gamaliel is called both *nomodidaskolos* and *pharisaios* (a sign that Luke would show the prime adversaries of Jesus as now in the background, as the Sadducean *archontes* emerge as the hard-hearted rejectors?).

[1] *Parachrēma*: used 16x in Luke-Acts, this almost exclusively Lucan word is employed mainly in connection with the healings. See, for example, Lk 1:64 (Zechariah's tongue); 4:39 (Peter's mother-in-law); 5:25 (here); 8:44,47 (the hemorrhage lady); 8:55 (Jairus' daughter); 13:13 (the bent woman); 18:43 (the Jericho blind man); Acts 3:7 (the man born lame).

emphasis on his obedient mobility (*apēlthen*). Luke's version also heightens the restorative aspect of the healing by (1) referring to the pallet as *eph' ho katekeito* and (2) indicating the destination of his journey (*eis ton oikon autou*), which places the emphasis on his mobility rather than his capacity to carry a load. The praising of the healed man turns out to be redactional not only here but also in Luke's description of the response of three other healed persons--the bent woman (13:13), the Samaritan leper (17:15), and the blind man of Jericho (18:43) (*doxazō* in each case; the synonym *aineō* describes the response of the man healed from lameness in Acts 3:8f).[1] The response of the crowd is described by each synoptist in his own way, and Luke's version has a peculiar apocalyptic intensity: "And amazement seized them all, and they glorified God and were filled with awe, saying, 'We have seen strange things today (*eidomen paradoxa sēmeron*).'" Within the context of the Third Gospel the word *sēmeron* of this verse associates this choral response with the other

---

[1] See also Acts 4:21 (the response of all of the people to the healing of the temple cripple), 11:16 (the response of the circumcision party--11:2--to Peter's narration of the Cornelius incident), 13:48 (the response of the Gentiles to the word of God spoken by Paul), and 21:20 (the response of the elders of Jerusalem to Paul's report of what God had done among the Gentiles through his ministry).

"today"-sayings of Luke which proclaim the presence of salvation--2:11; 4:21; 13:32f; 19:5,9; and 23:43. Clearly, the way that Luke orchestrates this particular healing suggests that he understands it to have a special significance within the scope of his theological work.[1] The healing of another immobile person, the man born lame in Acts, will receive similar celebration at the hands of the narrator, and he is perhaps preparing the reader now for what is to come more fully later.[2]

---

[1] This healing is evidently programmatic for Luke because of its emphasis on forgiveness--a dominant theme in Luke. See, for example, Lk 1:77 (knowledge of salvation is said to come through forgiveness of sins), 7:47 (the sinful woman is forgiven), and Acts 3:19 ("repent and turn again that your sins may be blotted out . . .").

[2] There are several elements which suggest comparison between this healing and the situation of Acts 3: in both cases (1) a lame man is carried onto the scene, (2) one thing is expected (a cure, in Lk 5; alms in Acts 3) and another thing is given (forgiveness in Lk 5; a cure in Acts 3), (3) the vivid demonstration of the healing is met with praise by both the healed person (Lk 5:25 *doxazōn ton theon*; Acts 3:9 *ainounta ton theon*) and the witnesses (Lk 5:26 *edoxazon ton theon*; Acts 4:21 *pantes edoxazon ton theon epi tō$_i$ gegonoti*).

A number of Lucan redactions suggest further parallelism between the two healings: Lk 5:17 ("the power of the Lord was with him to heal") and Acts 3:12f (not we but God) both emphasize the agency of *ho theos* in the healing; being filled with fear (Lk 5:26 *eplēsthēsan phobou*; Acts 3:10 *eplēsthēsan thambous*) is thematic in Luke-Acts. The noun *ekstasis*, as an emotional state in response to healing, is used only at Lk 5:26 and Acts 3:10 (the three other instances of *ekstasis* in Luke-Acts refer to the visions of Peter and Paul).

XUM

4. The Call of Levi (Lk 5:27-32)

The saying of Jesus, given to those who challenge his table fellowship with sinners--"Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick" (Lk 5:31;cf. Mk 2:17)[1]--is present already in the tradition mediated by Mark and clearly interprets Jesus' presence among sinners under the image of healing, perhaps even in his own self-understanding. But Luke makes one adjustment which, in a single stroke, integrates this pericope deeply into the fabric of his two-volume work: to the saying, "I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners," he adds "to repentance" (eis metanoian) (5:32). For metanoia and metanoeō are key words in the mission language of Luke-Acts.[2] And when Luke refers to the final outreach of the mission in the climactic ending of Acts, he again refers to conversion under the aspect of healing, this time using the words of Isaiah 6 (. . . kai epistrepsōsin kai iasomai autous) (Acts 28:27).[3]

---

[1] Luke's hygiaiontes contrasts more sharply with kakōs echontes than does Mark's ischyontes.

[2] See Lk 10:13; 11:32; 13:3,5; 15:7,10; 16:30; 24:47; Acts 2:38, 3:19; 5:31; 8:22; 11:18; 17:30; 20:21; 26:20.

[3] Both metanoeō and epistrepsō are used, either as synonyms or as complementary aspects, of conversions. See Lk 17:4; Acts 3:19; 26:18,20.

5. The Man with the Withered Hand (Lk 6:6-11)

The ironic appropriateness of Jesus healing on the sabbath is not lost on Luke, for whom Jesus' healing on the sabbath is not only a healthy scandal but a fitting fulfilment of the meaning of sabbath, the day when God's creative and liberating activities are remembered.[1] Indeed, whereas Mark rehearses two sabbath healings (1:21-28 [dropped by Mt] and 3:1-6 [retained by Mt], Luke not only repeats those but adds two more sabbath healings from his own tradition (the bent lady and the dropsical man). In the account of the man with the withered hand, Luke underlines the sabbath element through his recasting of the introduction. The previous pericope has just ended with the saying *Kyrios estin tou sabbatou ho huios tou anthrōpou* (6:5). With the *sabbatou* of that verse still ringing in the ear, the next verse begins *Egeneto de en heterōͅ sabbatōͅ eisēlthein auton eis tēn synagogēn kai didaskein*.[2] By means of that slight editorial adjustment, Jesus now enters the scene of the next healing precisely as Lord of the Sabbath (already there, to be sure, in Mark, but less explicitly).

---

[1] For sabbath as celebration of creation, see Ex 20:7 and 31:17; for sabbath as commemoration of deliverance, see Dt 5:12-15.

[2] In Luke's characteristic *egeneto* plus infinitive plus accusative--e.g., 1:8; 2:6; 5:12.

The other redactions in this story appear to be "softenings": as in his recital of the cure of the leper, Luke omits Mark's references to Jesus' emotion (Mk 3:5) and speaks rather of the rage of the scribes and the Pharisees (Lk 6:11); and, instead of having them plot immediately to destroy him (cf. Mk 3:6 hopōs auton apolesōsin), he incorporates the notion of the destruction within the saying about alternatives (psychēn sōsai ē apolesai; Mk has apokteinai at 3:4). Luke apparently does not want so severe a confrontation this early.[1]

6. The Summary before the Sermon (Lk 6:17-19)

The way Luke integrates this synoptic summary of healing with his treatment of Jesus' healing and preaching ministry is striking. For Mark, this summary (Mk 3:7ff) is a kind of global rounding off of 1:16-3:6, climaxing with the demonic confession. The Marcan account of the choice of the Twelve, then, begins a new movement (Mk 3:13-6:6) of teaching and healing. Strikingly, in the first disturbance of the Marcan order since Lk 5:1ff, Luke inverts the sequence of the summary and the choosing. Immediately after the healing of the man with the withered hand, Luke presents the choosing of the Twelve. (Thus the moves of his hostile opponents are matched with Jesus' choice for the continuing apostolic ministry, which includes the traitor. Jesus' own choice, and God's, includes the means of his death. He is not the mere victim of a plot.) Luke introduces the choice of the Twelve with another protracted withdrawal for prayer on Jesus' part. It is said not only that Jesus withdrew to the hill to pray in those days, but, as Luke adds in a paraphrastic phrase, "all night he continued in prayer to God" (*ēn dianyktereuōn en tē*$_i$ *prosuchē*$_i$ *tou theou* 6:13). As with the other occasions of prayerful withdrawal (baptism, transfiguration, etc.), Luke is clearly signalling a key moment in Jesus' ministry, here the choosing of the Twelve. It is significant that Luke omits the Marcan explanation (at Mk 3:14b) of the nature of that appointment--to be sent out to preach and to have authority to cast out demons. That information will come soon enough, in chapter 9; for the moment we are to concentrate solely on the ministry of Jesus.

---

[1] Or is it rather that he wants the Nazareth confrontation of Lk 4 to remain the chief confrontation in this early part of the narrative? The pattern of resistance to Jesus is also part of Luke's distinctive development of the "hardness of heart" motif; see F. W. Danker, "Hardness of Heart: A Study in Biblical Thematic," CTM 44 (1973):89-100; esp. 96f, on Luke.

XUM

Next we come to the summary of healing, which Luke has turned into a seamless transition for the movement from the prayerful withdrawal into the sermon. That climactic demonic confession of Mk 3:11 he drops here, having already used it at Lk 4:41. Then he adds, in a phrase echoing his addition to the leper story, that the people "came to hear him and be healed of their diseases" (6:18; see 5:15); then, in the next verse, he notes that "*dynamis* came forth from him to heal them all." What we have here, then, is precisely the cluster (same cluster, different sequence) of elements which we encountered in the movement from the cure of the leper into the healing of the paralytic:

1. a protracted prayerful withdrawal by Jesus (5:16; 6:12),
2. a reference to people coming to hear and be healed (5:15; 6:18),
3. a notice regarding *dynamis* present with Jesus for healing (5:17; 6:19).

Since Matthew also chooses to introduce a major block of sayings after this synoptic summary, a comparison of his treatment with Luke's is instructive. Mt 4:23-25 clearly works as a summary of his mission, more of a summary, even, than the Marcan and Lucan versions. For they both present it as happening on a particular occasion--a moment by the sea in Mark (3:7), a moment on the plain in Luke. Matthew, however, is summarizing a stretch of time involving movement "about all Galilee" (4:23) and crowds following him (4:25). It is a general summary, then, but it is also meant to introduce the sermon on the mount, for these surely are the crowds to which _tous ochlous_ of 5:1 refers. But with Mt 5:1 we have a fresh beginning and the healing is left in the background. The Lucan sermon, on the other hand, is rather more obviously couched in a healing setting than the Matthean sermon. Lk 6:17a established Jesus in his teaching locus (_estē epi topou pedinou_). Then the rest of v. 17 and the following two verses speak of his powerful healing. It is in the midst of that healing scene that the Lucan sermon commences.

Here again we find Luke fusing as closely as he can the word and work of Jesus; preaching and healing are components of a single ministry.

C. The Rest of the Galilean Ministry (7:1-9:50)

1. The Centurion's Servant (Lk 7:1-10)

Both Matthew and Luke place this cure in close proximity with their versions of the sermon. And for both evangelists, the issue of authority is an important element in the story. But Luke strengthens this element. He ties it securely to the sermon on the plain by means of the introduction: "After he ended all his sayings in hearing of the people" (eis tas akoas tou laou) he entered Capernaum" (7:1). The sermon has just ended on the theme that those who hear must do (6:46-49). The centurion is now presented as an example of a man who acts upon what he hears (see 7:3--akousas de peri tou Iēsou--only in Luke among the Synoptics; but see Jn 4:47. The fact that the encounter is played out through two sets of messengers, besides emphasizing the mediation of the Jews, underscores the dynamic of authority. The centurion is not only subject to authority but commands it. This hearing and acting--acknowledging Jesus' healing authority as part of a given power structure--is praised as faith (7:9).

Whereas in Mt 8 the request is for the authorative word of healing from the outset, Luke's version presents a progression from a request that Jesus come to the need of only a word--an adjustment which mirrors a special interest of Luke: the authority of the "absent" risen Lord is such that he need not come to be effective. This theme--together with the relationship of authority, healing, and the faith which is hearing and doing (motifs common to both Luke and Matthew)--all of this will be further elaborated in Acts 3-4.

2. The Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain (7:11-17)

Although we have no synoptic parallels to illuminate Luke's treatment of this account, it is highly instructive simply to note how the text relates to the full Lucan context. The choral responses (7:16) illustrate what we have found to be thematic to Luke's portrayal of Jesus' healing ministry. "A great prophet has been raised up among us." The motif of Jesus as prophet of God *par excellence*, developed especially in Lk 4, is here reaffirmed. And the other response, "God has visited (*epeskepsato*) his people," picks up the language of the *Benedictus* (1:68--*epeskepsato kai epoiēsen lytrōsin tō*$_i$ *laō*$_i$ *autou* and 1:78--*episkepsetai hēmas anatolē ex hypsous*--the only other two places where *episkeptomai* is used in the gospels), where the events of the gospel are globally celebrated as God's loving work.

Regarding the note of restoration, "Jesus gave him back to his mother" (7:15, *edōken auton tē*$_i$ *mētri autou*, echoing 3 Kgd 17:23), see the almost identical phrase which Luke adds to the synoptic account of the epileptic boy (see 9:42: *apedōken auton tō*$_i$ *patri autou*).

3. The Gergesene Demoniac (8:26-39)

Luke's retelling of this story emphasizes the "before" and "after" aspects of the process of restoration. The details and phrasing proper to Luke at the beginning are just the things he emphasizes at the end. In 8:27, the demoniac is said to be ek tēs poleōs and that for a long time ouk enedysato himation, and that he did not live en oikiā$_i$. All of these conditions are reversed at the end of the story. It is true that when Luke describes the man after the cure as himatismenon (8:35), he is only echoing Mark (5:15); but only Luke has added to the impact of this detail by his initial description of the man as naked. The wording of the concluding verse (8:39) was similarly prepared for. Again, eis ton oikon is already present in Mark, but Luke has prepared for it by the phrase en oikia$_i$ ouk emenen in verse 27 (cf. Mk 5:3). The revision of en tēi Dekapolei to kath'holēn tēn polin emphasizes the homecoming: the one who was said to be ek tēs poleōs (v. 27) now has a missionary role in that town. With respect to that last phrase, Luke's intention may well have been to postpone till Acts the broader preaching to the Gentiles, but the immediate effect upon the narrative is to celebrate the fulness of the healed man's homecoming.

At 8:39, Luke has *diēgou hosa soi epoiēsen ho theos* (cf. Mk 5:19b: *kai apangeilon autois hosa ho kyrios soi pepoiēken*). What may or may not be a distinction in Mark between God and Jesus (between *hosa ho kyrios . . . pepoiēken* and *hosa epoiēsen . . . ho Iēsous*) becomes unambiguous in Luke--*hosa . . . epoiēsen ho theos* and *hosa epoiēsen . . . ho Iēsous*. This emphasizes the ultimate agency of *ho theos* in Jesus' healings, a preoccupation with Luke, for whom Jesus always operates as the Christ of God.

Again, where Mark is content to present the bystanders as concerned with the event as spectacle ("Those who had seen it told what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine"--5:16), Luke recasts the verse in a way that emphasizes the "before" and "after" of the healing process: "And those who had seen it told them how he who had been possessed with demons (*ho daimonistheis*) was healed (*esōthē*)."[1]

---

[1] The implications of Luke's "salvation" vocabulary will be discussed in chapter four.

Although H. Held, in a footnote, lists most of the Lucan changes discussed above, he says of Luke's redaction of this pericope, "no deliberate shaping of the tradition can be recognized." H. J. Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories" in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held, *Tradition and and Interpretation in Matthew* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 175. Our findings would seem to suggest otherwise.

XUM

4. *Jairus' Daughter and the Woman Who Touched Jesus' Garment (Lk 8:40-56)*

Subtle though they may be, the changes which Luke introduces into his retelling of these stories are far more than mere narrative tidying up and introduction of Hellenistic motifs.[1]

V. 40: Luke drops explicit mention of the boat travel and the seaside setting (a geographical motif which, except for 5:1f, he chooses not to exploit in the Third Gospel), and introduces the note of expectation: *ēsan gar pantes prosdokōntes*. This is not merely typical Lucan periphrasis; the business of people waiting in expectation is a prominent theme in the Third Gospel. *Prosdokaō*[2] is used regarding messianic expectation in Lk 3:15 (the people expecting that John might be *ho Christos*) and 7:19,20, and eschatologically in 12:46 (cf. Mt 11:3 and 2Pt 3:12ff).

V. 41: Luke changes the speech of Jairus to indirect discourse, just as he eliminates the interior monologue of the woman with the flow of blood, whose faith will gradually become evident in a more dramatic way. Luke here reserves direct quotation of speech for the words of Jesus in verses 45 and 46.[1] In Jesus' words, Luke appears to make a point of the difference between *apothlibousin* and *hēpsato* (physical crowding *vs*. touching with faith) by having Jesus reiterate the phrase *tis ho hapsamenos mou . . . hēpsato mou* ("who touched me"; cf. Mk 5:30b: "Who touched my *garment*?"). He also more directly associates the touching with the experience of power going forth.

---

[1] *Pace* Held, ibid., pp. 180f.

[2] The LXX connotations of this word make it even more plausible that Luke used it for its eschatological overtones. See LXX text of Dt 32:2, Ps 68:21; 103:27; 118:166 (*prosedokōn to sōterion sou*); Lam 2:16. [Unless otherwise indicated, OT texts will be cited according to LXX names and numbering and according to the text of A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*, 8th ed. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965).]

V. 42: As others have noted, Luke adds to the poignancy of the account by introducing the status (*monogenē*; cf. the *monogenēs* at 9:38) and the age of the child (*etōn dōdeka*, pulled up here from its anticlimactic position at the end of Mark). The new place of the *etōn dōdeka* sets up a catchword connection with *etōn dōdeka* of the next verse, the length of the woman's illness. This kind of catchword binding of the two healing stories also occurs in another way: the fact of the healing is recorded in strikingly similar words:

v. 44: *parachrēma estē hē hrysis*[2]
v. 55: *anestē parachrēma*.

---

[1] A similar change from interior monologue to external expression occurs at Lk 5:21 (the questioning of the Pharisees; cf. Mk 2:6).

[2] Mk 5:29 has *exēranthē hē pēgē*.

V. 47: *ouk elathen*[1] and the testimony *enōpion pantos tou laou* are in line with Luke's constant interest in the "publicity" of the healings.[2] None of them is done "in a corner." This motif appears to be borne out in the story of Jairus' daughter as well. For Luke does not have Jesus expel the mourners and, though it is admittedly ambiguous, the text is open to the interpretation that the mourners of v. 52 are present to witness the healing (to be sure, this would intensify the problem of keeping the secret enjoined in v. 56).[3]

---

[1] See Acts 26:26.

[2] A factor emphasized in the summary descriptions of Jesus and his work at Lk 24:19 (. . . "mighty in deed and work before God and all the people . . .") and at Acts 2:22 (". . . a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know . . .").

[3] It may be instructive at this point to compare Luke's rendition of Jairus' daughter with his account of Tabitha in Acts 9:36ff, and Mark's version of the raising of the *talitha* (Mk 5:21ff). Comparing first Acts 9 with Lk 8: both Jesus and Peter, in answer to a request, come to a house, enter it, and raise a female from the dead; in both cases the dead person responds to a simple command: "Arise" (*hē pais egeire*, Lk 8:54 and *Tabitha*, *anastēthi*, Acts 9:40); in both cases the healer takes the person by the hand--Jesus, as he calls out the command; Peter, after the woman opens her eyes and sits up. Now, regarding the relationship of these two accounts with Mk 5, if Luke uses Mk 5:21ff as his *Vorlage* for the raising of the daughter of Jairus, it is curious that he omits in his version of that story the very elements in which his Tabitha story most resembles Mark's *talitha* story--i.e., *ekbalōn pantas* (Mk 5:40; see *ekbalōn de exō pantas*, Acts 9:40) and *talitha koum* (Mk 5:41; see *Tabitha, anastēthi*, Acts 9:40). Why does Luke omit in Lk 8 the details

The command to silence at 8:56b differs from Mk 5:43 in that it is addressed explicitly to the parents. Inasmuch as the following verses in Luke are the commission of the Twelve to preach and heal, perhaps the charge to silence is retained, not in service of the Marcan messianic secret but to highlight the apostolic prerogatives of Peter, John, and James. The parents are to keep quiet; the apostles will spread the news.

The introduction of Peter as spokesman at v. 45 and the reordering of the names at v. 51 (Peter, John, and James)--these items are significant for what will happen in Acts and will be discussed in that place.

5. The Mission of the Twelve (Lk 9:1-6)

Here again, comparison with Mark (quite apart from any theory of dependency) reveals that Luke's placement and expression of discipleship material shows his characteristic patterns and special interests. Since the "failure" at Nazareth has already been told

---

which Acts 9 has most in common with Mk 5? Perhaps the Tabitha story is modeled on the *talitha* story and Luke does not wish to call attention to the source. Or, perhaps both stories came to him independently and he wishes, for the sake of his characteristic interest in variety, to play down the similarity between the stories of Lk 8 and Acts 9. In either case, we have a strong impression of an author who is quite conscious of the interrelation of the parts of his two-volume work and very much in control of his material.

(indeed, elaborated) in Lk 4, the movement from the healings of the demoniac and the women is immediate; and whereas in Mark the mission of the Twelve, coming as it does after the rounding off accomplished by the brief summary of Mk 6:6b, clearly marks the beginning of a new movement, Luke's version of this material (like the calling of Lk 6:12ff) moves seamlessly from the healings of Jesus to his sending of the Twelve. And Luke's composition of the introductory verses indicates that he is very much aware of the continuity. "He called the twelve together and gave them power (*dynamin*) and authority over all demons and *to cure diseases* (*kai nosous therapeuein*) *and he sent them out to preach the kingdom of God and to heal* (*iasthai*)." (9:1f) The italicized portions are proper to Luke. The use of *dynamis* carries with it, in the full context of Luke, the notion of succession;[1] for the whole mission of Jesus (4:14,36), and his healing especially (5:17 [paralytic]; 6:19 [summary]; and 8:46 [bleeding woman]), have been presented as empowered by the *dynamis* of the Spirit and the Lord; and now Jesus sends forth the Twelve with *dynamis*. And, while Mark's version does include both preaching and healing, Luke's way of

---

[1] Proleptic at this point, since, as our investigation of Acts 3-4 will show, the full inheritance has not yet been gained.

XUM

putting it emphasizes strongly--even more than Mt. 10:7--the coordinate nature of preaching and healing: they are sent *kēryssein tēn basileian tou theou kai iasthai* (9:2). That unity is again highlighted by the deliberate parallelism in verse 6: "And they departed and went through the villages, *euangelizomenoi kai therapeuontes pantachou*."

6. *The Feeding of the Five Thousand (9:11)*

Luke's integration of the healing and preaching ministry with the account of the feeding of the five thousand is distinctive within the synoptic tradition and quite consistent with the pattern which our study of the narrative is beginning to reveal. Where Mk 6:34 has "As he landed he saw a great throng, and he had compassion on them because they were like sheep without a shepherd, and he began to teach them many things," Matthew and Luke introduce references to healing at this point. Mt 14:14: "As he went ashore he saw a great throng, and he had compassion on them (*kai etherapousen tous arrōstous autōn*)." And Lk 9:11: "When the crowds learned it, they followed him: and he welcomed them and *spoke of the kingdom of God and cured those who had need of healing* (*kai tous chreian echontas therapeias iato*)." Thus, whereas Mark speaks of teaching and Matthew of healing, Luke, as we have come to expect, combines teaching and healing.

7. The Healing of a Boy with an Unclean Spirit (9:37-43)

Both Matthew and Luke pare this pericope down to less than half its size in Mark, and each gives it hiw own very distinctive treatment. From among the elements present in the Marcan version (the powerlessness of the disciples, the case history of the boy, the challenge to the father's faith), Matthew elects to develop as the main point the theme of the little faith of the disciples; while Luke, omitting that point entirely, makes his focus aspects of the healing barely hinted at in either Mark or Matthew--the restoration of the boy and the response of the crowd. Mark and Matthew spotlight the change in the lad himself--Mark using language that suggests allusion to the resurrection (*hōsei nekros . . . apethanen . . . ēgeiren auton, iad anestē*, Mk 9:26f) and Matthew simply stating the fact (*etherapeuthē, Mt 17:18*). For Luke, however, the focus is more global and features not just the change within the boy but the restored familial relationship: *kai iasato ton paida kai apedōken auton tō$_i$ patri autou* (9:42b).[1]

---

[1] That this kind of restoration is a concern of Luke is evident not only in the redactions reviewed in

XUM

8. The Transition to the Second Passion Prediction (9:43ff)

And now, just where Mark and Matthew allow a clear break and begin new movements in their gospels, Luke chooses to bind this healing story with what follows by introducing a crowd response that has a firm editorial connection with the second passion prediction.

V. 43a: "And all were astonished at the majesty (megaleiotēti)[1] of God." This part of the verse looks backwards and seems, at first, to refer only to what has just happened immediately before. But the verse continues: (v.43b) "But while they were all marveling at everything he did (pantōn de thaumazontōn epi pasin hois epoiei), he said to his disciples . . . ." This clause, too, looks backwards, but the pasin hois epoiei (note the imperfect) suggests that more than the cure of the epileptic child is referred to; indeed, there is no reason to exclude any of Jesus' ministry up to this point; it can be taken as a response to the whole. But, as a genitive absolute, this clause also sets the scene for what is to follow: "'Let these words sink into your

---

our examination of the Gergesene demoniac, but also in the almost identical words found in the Nain resuscitation: kai edōken auton tē; metri autou, Lk 7:15b.

Note also that, like Lk 7:15, this phrase is an allusion to the gesture of Elijah at 3 Kgd 17:23.

[1] See Jer 40:9 LXX (a Septuagint hapax legomenon), which occurs in a context where the Lord promises to heal (40:6) and rebuild (40:7) Israel.

ears; for the Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men.'" (9:44).[1] Strikingly, Luke's version of this second synoptic passion prediction ends abruptly here, with the expected reference to the resurrection omitted. The effect of this redactional transition is that the healing ministry is brought into close juxtaposition with a passion reference.[2] It is as if Luke were preparing the reader (or listener) for the paradoxical spectacle of the hanged healer; for though he will eliminate the taunt about the temple, he will emphasize the paradox of the healer unable finally to save himself; he repeats the taunt,"Save yourself" twice--by the soldiers (23:37) and by one of the thieves (23:39). That the majesty of God, expressed in the healing ministry of his Christ,[3] must somehow be integrated with the suffering of the Son of Man--this is a mystery hidden from the disciples until Easter time.[4]

---

[1] Note, again, words as correlative to deeds.

[2] See section F below.

[3] Lk 9:43 is similar to 7:16; 8:39 and Acts 2:22 and 10:30 in highlighting Jesus' work as presenting the action of ho theos.

[4] That the disciples' failure to understand is, according to Luke, not their fault but the plan of God, is suggested by Luke's presentation of the reaction of the disciples to each of the three passion predictions: in the first one, he deletes the rebuke of Peter; here it is said that the passion saying was veiled (parakekalymenon, 9:45) from them; and the third time around (Lk 18:34), the saying is hidden from them (kekrymenon) "and they did not grasp what was said."

XUM

For an evangelist who is reputed to have no theologia crucis, this treatment of the second passion prediction shows a remarkable concern for seeing the healing ministry in connection with the cross, the climactic deed.

D. Some Healing Material in the Center Section

Since the primary purpose of this chapter is to survey Luke's method in retelling the healing narratives, we will simply make passing observations on some healing references which, while not narrative, still reveal a Lucan understanding of the healing ministry which is pertinent to our study. A more detailed discussion of the three center section healings proper to Luke (the bent woman, the dropsical man, and the ten lepers) will be provided in section E.

1. The Charge to the Seventy-Two and the Woes over the Galilean Cities (Lk 10:1-15)

In his presentation of this Q material, Luke binds more strongly than ever the unity of healing and preaching: "Heal the sick in it [the town where they receive you] and say to them, 'The Kingdom of God has come near to you.'" (Lk 10:9).[1] The same announcement

---

[1] Cf. Jesus' interpretation of his exorcism work at Lk 11:20: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." On this verse and its Matthean parallel (12:28), see C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: SPCK, 1947; 1970), pp. 64,92,131,140,144.

(engiken hē basileia tou theou) is to be made to non-receptive cities (10:11f), but in this case, as doom of judgment. Healing is a proclamation of the kingdom, the rejection of which brings down judgment.

Luke reinforces this point by placing here the woes over the Galilean cities (10:13-15). The appropriate response to the healing-proclamation is metanoia. Failure to respond means judgment. This will be elaborated fully in Acts 3-4.

2. The Blind Man of Jericho (Lk 18:35-43)

The following differences from the Marcan version about Bartimaeus may be significant: v. 35 en tōi engizein auton eis Ierichō (whereas Mark's account has the encounter happen on the way out of Jericho, Luke must place it on the way in, for he apparently wants it to occur before the Zacchaeus account, which happens in Jericho): v. 40 ekeleusen auton achthēnai pros auton (where Mark has Jesus instruct the bystanders to call the blind man, who thereupon springs up and comes forward, Luke says that Jesus commanded him to be brought to him, thereby emphasizing the relative immobility of the blind man);[1] vs. 43; this windup verse is both characteristic of and peculiar to Luke; as in his accounts of the paralytic, the bent woman, the Samaritan leper, and the temple beggar in Acts, the healed blind man glorifies God; and as in the accounts of the crowds at Nain, the epileptic boy, the shepherds (2:20), and the centurion under the cross (23:47), the crowd praises God because of what they have seen.[1] Luke does not use the *en tē$_{i}$ hodō$_{i}$* of Mk 10:52. It seems odd that he should overlook this opportunity to exploit the motif of the road (also lacking at 9:18 [cf. Mk 8:27] and 9:46f [cf. Mk 9:33f]; nor is Mk 10:32 reproduced). It may be that, just as he passes over the withdrawal for prayer at Mk 1:35 (cf. Lk 4:42) but then introduces it at Mk 1:45 (cf. Lk 5:16), here he chooses to pass over a motif which will receive sufficient development in the book of the Way which is Acts.

---

[1] Note that in the parable of the great supper in Lk 14, the poor, lame, crippled, and blind are to be led in (14:21) and made to enter (anankason eiselthein, 14:23).

---

[1] As in Mk 10:52 and Mt 20:34, *akolouthein* occurs in Lk 18:43. Luke generally uses this verb in a way that mirrors the motif of discipleship developed in the synoptic tradition. Where Luke does not repeat a Markan instance of this verb, there seems to be good reason: It is missing in Lk 6:17 (cf. Mk 3:7) perhaps because all of the crowd does not yet qualify as disciples; it is lacking in Lk 8:42b (cf. Mk 5:24), again apparently because most of that pressing crowd are not following in the sense of full discipleship; it is absent at Lk 4:16 (cf. Mk 6:1) because in Luke Jesus comes to Nazareth alone, the gathering of followers not commencing until Lk 5; and the Marcan scene of awe-filled following at Mk 10:32 is simply not reproduced in Luke. *Akolouthein* is introduced in two places: at Lk 22:39 (where the disciples are said to follow Jesus to Gethsemane, perhaps a preparation for 22:28) and at 23:27 (the notice about the crowd of people and weeping women).

There, the way of the church will lead not *to* Jerusalem, but *from* that city to the ends of the earth. It may be, too, that Luke is more interested at this point in contrasting the *proagontes* of v. 39 (where it is redactional) with the blind man who *follows*, Jesus being the true *proagōn*.

But more suggestive--and perhaps even more important--is the way in which Luke stitches this episode into the larger fabric of his narrative. Mark seems to have seen an intimate relationship between the Bartimaeus cure and the incident which immediately precedes it, for the material from the third passion prediction through the healing is framed by an inclusion signaled by the catchwords *en tē$_i$ hodō$_i$* in verses 10:32 and 52; and the incidents are firmly associated by the same question posed by Jesus, first to the brothers Zebedee and then to Bartimaeus, "What would you have me do?" (Mk 10:36,51) and the sharply contrasting answers--the brothers answering out of ignorance, Bartimaeus out of faith. The first thing synoptic comparison reveals is that Luke omits entirely the embarrassing exchange between the Zebedees and Jesus (in a way typical of his characteristic softening of the faults of the twelve),[1] passes over the word about baptism (a similar saying

---

[1] We have already seen that Luke accounts for their misunderstanding in another way (18:34).

XUM

interpreting his ministry as a baptism has already been used at Lk 12:50), and postpones till the supper (22: 24-27) the dispute among the disciples and Jesus' word about authority. The net effect of these editorial omissions and postponement is to bring into close narrative juxtaposition four elements: (1) the rich ruler (18:18-30), (2) the passion prediction (18:31-34),[1] (3) the healing of the Jericho blind man (18:35-43), and (4) the conversion of Zacchaeus (19:1-10). Now the question is whether this arrangement is simply the result of having to stitch the tradition together in some kind of sequence or whether the arrangement provides an interpretive context. (What we have, after all, is a narrative, not a mere scrapbook of fragments.)

One of the effects of the editing of Lk 18:18-19:10 is that it invites reflection comparing the blind man and Zacchaeus (two seekers who are saved) and comparing also the rich rule and Zacchaeus (two rich men whose responses are quite the opposite).

Regarding that first comparison, there is a kind of binocular parallelism between the cure of blindness and the Zacchaeus incident, which follows immediately. Like the nameless blind man, Zacchaeus was unable to see who Jesus was (19:3), experienced the murmuring of the crowd (19:7), remains resolute, and is finally transformed through faith in the Jesus he acknowledges as Lord (19:8; cf. 18:41). It may be that Luke suppressed the name of the blind man and placed him on the way to Jericho because he is really in a sense Zacchaeus inasmuch as his faith healing from blindness illustrates precisely what is to happen in Zacchaeus, whose whole effort, after all, was "to see who Jesus was" (19:3).

---

[1] Although Lk 18:31ff is the counterpart of Mark's third passion prediction (Mk 10:32ff), it could be called the sixth passion prediction in Luke; for, along with the parallels to Mark at Lk 9:31,44, he has Jesus speak three further predictions in the center section--Lk 12:50; 13:32f, and 17:25.

As regards the larger editorial context (Lk 18:18-19:10), the rich man of 18:18ff and Zacchaeus need to be cured of analogous blindness. But the rich man can only acknowledge Jesus as "good master," cling to his property, and become sad. Whereas Zacchaeus calls Jesus Lord, distributes his goods, and receives Jesus with joy. What we have here, then, is a kind of narrative triptych, the center panel being the story of a literal cure of a blind man, and the two outside panels being the stories of men blinded by their riches, one of whom will not be freed through the encounter with Jesus, and the other, Zacchaeus, who is open to the gift of salvation (19:9).

Embedded in this triptych (or, to respect the image, the hinge between the first and second panel) is

Luke's version of the "third" passion prediction. If this section is an editorial unity, Luke must integrate this material. As was observed above, Luke alters the explanation of the disciples' failure to understand the meaning of the passion/resurrection prediction. In Mark's context, the misunderstanding is not explained but demonstrated narratively through the Zebedee brothers' request for a share in glory; in his context, then, the blindness of the disciples is the failure to perceive Jesus' identity as Christ in function of his being also suffering Son of Man, and the corresponding implications regarding the nature of discipleship as following on that same road to Jerusalem. This theme is not absent in Luke, as we saw in our discussion of his editing of the second passion prediction, in connection with the healing of the epileptic boy.[1] But here Luke seems preoccupied with another kind of blindness. The understanding that the Christ must suffer--this is an understanding of the plan of God (as expressed in all the prophets) which will come with the dawning of Easter (see Lk 24:26f and 46ff). The blindness to true discipleship which preoccupies Luke here is the attachment to material goods.[1] This theme is, of course, already in the tradition as Mark relates it (see the same conjunction of the rich young man and the discourse on riches and the rewards of discipleship in Mk 10:17-31), but a new emphasis is achieved through the Lucan shift by which the blindness cure and the Zacchaeus pericope are "attracted" to this complex of material on riches and discipleship. All of this suggests that Mark and Luke contextualize the blindness cure in ways that make it symbolize different kinds of spiritual blindness. One has to do with the place of suffering, the other with the place of material goods. Each evangelist uses the tradition in a way coherent with the thematic thrust of his particular gospel.[2]

---

[1] The Zacchaeus episode is remarkably connected with the passion prediction inasmuch as the encounter of Jesus with the tax collector reflects the Lucan crucifixion scene, where, again, while bystanders murmur, the Son of man saves a "lost one" (23:42f).

E. Three Healings Proper to Luke

There are three major healings--the bent woman, the dropsical man, and the grateful Samaritan leper--which only Luke, among the synoptists, tells us. And because he incorporates them in the central section of his gospel, where one suspects he exercises the greatest freedom in his editing of the tradition, it is here especially that we may expect the Lucan mind and hand to show themselves.

---

[1] See the interconnection of blindness and hardness of heart implicit in the use of Is 6 at Acts 28:26f. Attachment to goods is a primary community fault in the incident of Ananias and Sapphirain Acts 5.

[2] This analysis of Luke's use of the blind man tradition relies heavily upon André Paul, "La guérison de l'aveugle (des aveugles) de Jericho," Foi et vie: Cahier biblique 9 (1970):44-69.

1. The Bent Woman (Lk 13:10-17)

First, a look at the movement of the narrative itself. A woman, powerless for the past eighteen years to stand up straight, is enabled suddenly, through the word and touch of Jesus, to assume her full stature. A debate about the appropriateness of such a healing on the sabbath day ensues. The upshot is a community divided between those who are shamed and those who rejoice.

The most immediately striking feature of the story is the liberation motif embodied in the action itself and in the language which describes it. The condition of the woman is portrayed in words which stress the gap between the way she is and the way she is meant to be: *kai mē dynamenē anakypsai eis to panteles* (13:11b). And the cure is described in words which suggest immediate restoration: *parachrēma anōrthōthē* (v. 13). But the theme of release is even more evident in the words of Jesus. He announces the healing with the word, *gynai apolelysai tēs astheneias sou* (v. 12).

XUM

In his rebuttal to the synagogue official, he couches his argument in an analogy having to do with freeing: "Hypocrites, which of you does not untie (*lyei*) his ox or donkey from the stall to lead it to drink; and this daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound (edēsen) for eighteen years, should she not be *loosed* from her bonds (*lythēnai apo tou desmou toutou*) on the sabbath day?" In a work which is permeated with the language of release to freedom (from the designation of Jesus' mission as liberation in the Isaian quote at Lk 4:18, right on to the final word of Acts, in which Paul is described as pursuing his mission unhindered, *akōlytōs*, Acts 28:31)[1]--in such a context the liberation language is not merely colorful imagery.[2]

Now, when we reread the pericope, sensitive to the allusive qualities of the diction, the associations are as unified as they are suggestive. Before the cure, the woman is said not to be able to straighten up (*anakypsai*)--a word which is used in only one other

---

[1] See G. Delling, "Die Letzte Wort der Apostelgeschichte," *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973):187-204.

[2] C. F. Evans' hypothesis that the central section of Luke was patterned after the arrangement of material in Deuteronomy is interesting here. According to this theory, the cure of the bent woman matches with Dt 15:1-18, the passage on the sabbatical year featuring motifs of release of debts and slaves. C. F. Evans, "The Central Section," p. 46.

XUM

place in Luke-Acts, at Lk 21:28, where it describes the posture one is to take when the signs of the coming of the Son of Man begin to happen: "When these things begin to happen, straighten up (*anakypsate*) and raise your heads, because your redemption (*apolytrōsis*) is drawing near."

Although in itself, the use of this word of the woman at 13:11 does not prove that the author intended a connection, other similar apparent allusions in this passage make it plausible that Luke wants his readers to understand the woman as being empowered to assume the eschatological posture. Arguing in this direction, for example, is the use of *anōrthōthē* (13:13) to describe the healing. Again, this is a word used just twice in Luke-Acts.[1] The only other usage is Acts 15:16, where it is *inserted*[2] (either by Luke or the tradition before him) into the LXX quote of Amos 9:11 and refers to the endtime restoration of David's house.[1] Given the fact that the use of this word in Acts 15:16 is quite possibly Lucan redaction,[2] the hint that Luke intends eschatological allusion in *anakypsai* gains plausibility.[3]

---

[1] The third NT use of *anorthoō* deserves at least our passing attention. It occurs in Heb 12:12f: "So strengthen [*anorthōsate*] your drooping hands and your weak knees. Make straight the paths you walk on [*trochias orthas poieite tois posin*], that your halting limbs may not be dislocated but healed [*iathe*$_i$]." In the context of our discussion of the Lucan healing accounts, this passage from Hebrews is notable for two things: (1) the use of healing from lameness as a figure to describe Christian transformation, and (2) the interest in the word *anorthoō*, which here substitutes for *ischysate*, the word used in Is 35:3 (the text paraphrased at Heb 12:12).

[2] G. Lohfink observes this, too. See "Christologie und Geschichtsbild in Apg 3,19-21," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 13 (1969):230.

---

[1] This Lucan use of Amos 9:11f at Acts 15:16f will be discussed at greater length in chapter 5.

[2] It does not appear in the LXX and Luke does show elsewhere that he is interested in the motif of restoration (see *apokatastasis* in Acts 3:21, a verse that will be discussed at some length in a later chapter.

[3] A look at the LXX use of *anōrthoō* is suggestive.

In eight instances the word occurs in specifically Davidic contexts, mainly in the two versions of the Nathan oracle (2 Kgd 7:13,16,26; 1 Chron 17:12,14, 42).

Ps 17:36 LXX: *kai hē paideia sou anōrthōse me eis telos*. The LXX epigraph describes this psalm as being what David sang "in the day in which the Lord delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies."

Three verses of Ps 19:7ff LXX are worth quoting in full: "Now we know that the Lord has saved his *Christos*: he shall hear him from his holy heaven; the salvation of his right hand is mighty. Some glory in chariots, and some in horses, but we will glory in the name of the Lord our God. They are overthrown and fallen; but we are risen (*anestēmen*) and have been set upright (*anorthōthēmen*)." Among other things, this text gives Luke precedence for equating these terms in his version of Amos 9 at Acts 15:16, where at Amos 9:11 he substitutes *anorthōso* for *anastēsō*.

Ps 144:14 LXX: "The Lord supports all that are falling and sets up (*anorthoi*) all that are broken down."

Ps 145:7bf LXX: "The Lord looses the fettered ones (*lyei pepedemenous*) . . . The Lord sets up the broken down (*anorthoi katerragmenous*)." Besides the striking resonances with the bent woman pericope, this psalm is a good one to read to observe how "Lucan" a Septuagint psalm can be.

In Jer 10:12 and 40:2 (LXX) the word is used of

As regards the occurrence of this healing on the sabbath day, a new note is struck. In the words of Jesus, that this woman should be healed on the Sabbath day is not merely permissible, but somehow appropriate and even necessary: *ouk edei lythēnai . . . tēi hēmerai tou sabbatou*? Sabbath and freedom are intimately connected. For, according to the deuteronomic tradition, "You shall remember that you were a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you thence with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm: therefore the Lord your God commanded you to keep the sabbath day" (Dt 5:12ff). Now it is *ho Kyrios* (13:15) who answers *ho archisynagōgos*; the last time an issue was made of Jesus' healing on the sabbath, he was presented as operating precisely as Lord of the sabbath (*kyrios tou sabbatou*, 6:5f). As most commentators[1] have noticed, the *endoxois* of 13:17 carries LXX associations with the mighty deeds of the Lord during the exodus; see, for example Dt 10:21 and, especially,

---

his creative action. Jer 40:2 is particularly striking, for after this introductory verse, in which he is designated as creator, the oracle goes on, after reviewing the work of his wrath, to promise Juda healing: *iatreusō autēn*.

Thus, virtually all the LXX uses of *anorthoō* refer to the restorative action of God. Two of the three New Testament uses of the word (Acts 15:16 and Heb 12:12) insert it in OT quotations which are clearly eschatological (Amos 9 and Is 35). It is, then, surely possible that Luke used the word with that connotation at Lk 13:13.

[1] Schmid, *in loc.*, and Grundmann, *in loc.*, for example.

Ex 34:10, where the *endoxa* are the Lord's works in the takeover of the land--the prelude to the *rest* which the sabbath recalls.[1]

Everything about this story, then, from the nature of the cure to the language in which it is told, portrays the action of Jesus as being in continuity with the OT (especially exodus) saving action of the Lord. The immediate context provides evidence which suggests that Luke has arranged the surrounding material in a way that further interprets this healing account. The story of the bent woman constitutes the editorial center of a chiasm which may be outlined this way:

---

[1] D. Derrett makes the following observations about the rabbinic and OT background of this pericope: "The Targums on the Pentateuch which unquestionably derive from midrashic material commonly known in Jesus' time tell us at Gn 3:18 that Adam prayed in particular not to have to eat bent double, but to stand upright, to work with his hands, and not to be confused with animals (at the trough, as it were). Luke's *anorthōthē* is related to that. In his view Jesus arrived and was the woman's saviour from a condition from which God released Adam (and his issue at Gn 3:19. [This, D. observes is an implicit victory over the serpent (alias Satan) and the mention of 18 years' unfreedom may well be an allusion to two eighteen-year periods of bondage mentioned in the book of Judges (3:14; 10:8; 11)] "We are told in those passages that as a penalty for forgetfulness of God and disobedience to him the children of Israel were enslaved (i.e., bound) by Eglon the king of Moab and later the Philistines. At Jdg. 3:13 and 10:12 we are told that the children of Amalek were in part responsible for this. Now we know for certain that Amalek represents the evil inclination, Satan. These figures were taken allegorically. From those two enslavements the children of Israel were saved by God by means of two saviours respectively. The first, Ehud, is actually called a saviour (*moshiy'a*) and in the Tragum the word used is *pariyq*, which means "redeemer." The second was Jephthah. We need be in no doubt but that the idea was that eighteen years was a period after which God would give a particular generation freedom from the machinations of Satan. Thus Jesus is seen enacting the work of the second Adam . . . ." J. Duncan M. Derrett, "The Manger: Ritual Law and Soteriology," *Theology* 74 (1971):566-571; quotation, p. 571.

A (12:49-53) Words of Jesus on the completion of
his painful mission (*pōs synechomai heōs hotou telesthē$_i$*, v. 50)
In one *oikos* five will be divided, two against three.

B (12:54-13:5) Judgment sayings and parables
Catchwords: *dysmon* (v. 54), *noton* (v. 55)
Parable about urgent effort (*dos ergasian*, (12:58)

C (13:6-9) Growth parable (fig tree)
Catchword: *tria etē* (v. 7)

D (13:10-17) Healing of the bent woman

C' (13:18-21) Growth parables (mustard seed and leaven)
Catchword: *sata tria* (v. 21)

B' (13:22-30) Judgment sayings and parables
Catchwords: *dysmōn, notou* (v. 29)
Parable about urgent effort (*agonizesthe*, v. 24)

A' (13:31-35) Words of Jesus on the completion of
his painful mission (*tē$_i$ tritē$_i$ teleioumai*)
Your *oikos* will be forsaken.

The outer frame, A-A', focuses on the *time* of Jesus' ministry as he moves toward its completion in Jerusalem and it presents the whole ministry under the aspect of a visitation bringing judgment.[1] Parts B and B' present sayings which urgently call the listener to recognize the present moment and to settle up, enter, seize the day through repentance.[2] The growth parables of C-C' reflect on the theme of the kairos more positively; they provide images of opportunity and hope. Now the healing of the bent woman illuminates all this from the center by providing a concrete acting out of the issues involved: to those who can recognize the time of the visitation of God, the Abrahamic blessing is available now, through the encounter with the healing Lord (here the divided response of the witness mirrors the judgment motif of the frame A-A'). On the level of the historical ministry of Jesus, the opportunity was there to be taken or rejected by those who met Jesus then. On the level of the evangelist (as we learn from reading the whole of Luke-Acts), the Abrahamic blessing is still offered now through the encounter with the healing Lord which comes through the mission of the church. Like the Lucan presentation of the "day" at Capernaum in Lk 7, the whole section 12:49-13:35 is edited to focus on the identity of Jesus. He is a sign of contradiction. His ministry offers the blessing of the Father, but to those who reject it the offer of blessing becomes a judgment of doom.[1]

---

[1] Grimm, "Eschatologischer Saul wider eschatologischen David, Eine Deutung von Lc xiii 31ff.," Nov. Test. 15 (1973):114-133, sees a relationship between the baptism of fire section and the "fox Herod" section--which indirectly supports the parallelism.

[2] Some commentators have noticed a connection between the fig tree parable and the healing. For example, Creed quotes with disapproval Loisy, "The Fathers who saw the Church symbolized by the woman who was healed as opposed to the unfruitful and proscribed fig-tree of the synagogue, have perhaps unintentionally hit upon the idea which has determined the arrangement of these fragments." (p. 364 in Loisy) To that Creed replies, "Not one phrase or one word suggests the symbolism which Loisy wishes to find" (Creed, p. 182). Our findings suggest otherwise.

Again Derrett's remarks are suggestive: "The position of this parable immediately before the story of the healing of the crippled woman suggests to me that originally this parable also dealt with the Coming of the End. Just as a barren tree is spared until proper treatment has been shown to fail, so the Age to Come, in which all trees and plants will bear prodigiously, is postponed until the immediately suitable 'treatment' has been applied to the existing Age, which is the precursor of the next. Whatever the original meaning of the parable, St. Luke links the last opportunity for repentance (Lk 13:5) with the marvellous redemption of a daughter of Abraham from the curse of Adam by means of a story explaining that time has been afforded for the conditions to mature, and, as we have seen, for the righteous to manifest themselves and be available as 'fruit' for their 'owner.' That the gardener is the New Adam would on that basis, be a reasonable conjecture, especially since Adam's curse figures in the woman's predicament." Derrett, "Fig-trees in the New Testament," The Heythrop Journal 14 (1973):260f.

---

[1] Two further observations, whose implications will be pursued in the final chapter:

A. Schlatter notes that the community personified is addressed as bath shelabraham (daughter of Abraham) in Tanch AB 7.45. A Schlatter, Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinem Quellen erklärt (Stuttgart: Calwer

Although this is a healing story and the Zacchaeus account is a conversion story, Luke sees both as presenting the same kind of encounter with Jesus, which is why Jesus can say to the tax collector: "Today salvation has happened in this house, for this man, too, is a son of Abraham" (19:9). In the midst of hostility, both a son and a daughter of Abraham encounter salvation in Jesus.

2. The Man with Dropsy (Lk 14:1-6)

This healing is very much like that of the bent woman. Jesus, one sabbath in a group, encounters a sick person, whom he releases from disease. In answer to the objection (this time unspoken) to such action on the sabbath, Jesus points out that the observers would not hesitate to do on a sabbath for a son or ox what he has done for this stranger. The story also has much in common with Matthew's version of the healing of the withered hand (Mt 12:9-14).[1] But the

---

Verlag, 1960; zweite Auflage), in loc.

The parable of the mustard seed (Lk 13:19) alludes to Ez 17:23, where the tree is an image of Israel restored.

[1] Peculiar to Matthew's account of that healing is the question, here addressed to Jesus, ei exestin tois sabbasin therapeusai (Mt 12:10b), which is virtually identical with Lk 14:3b, and the question from Jesus, "What man of you, if he has one sheep and it falls into a pit on the sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out?" (Mt 12:11), which is very much like the question of Lk 14:5.

XUM

account of Lk 14:1-6 is no mere copy or random reworking of elements from other healing stories in the synoptic tradition. As will become clear, it has its own integrity and deserves to be read carefully on its own terms.

Taking the cue from what we have learned about Luke's method from examining his treatment of the previous healings, we will pay special attention to his handling of the liberation theme, his use of vocabulary which seems to reinforce his thematic concerns through the Septuagintal connotations these words carry with them, and, finally, his use of the immediate context to interpret the healing narrative.

With respect to the liberation theme, the word apelysen (14:4) is highly suggestive. Apolyō means everything from "to send away" to "divorce." In Luke-Acts, the word is used frequently in the sense of release from prison or bondage of some kind.[1] Given the fact that Luke reports Jesus as saying to the bent

---

[1] See, for example, the proclamation of release (aphesis) which characterizes the mission of Jesus (4:18ff), the mutual release advocated in the sermon on the plain (6:37), the references to releasing Jesus or Barabbas (23:16,18,20,22,25), the releasing of the apostles from custody in Acts (e.g., Acts 4:21 and 5:40), and the aphesis hamartiōn, a kernel of synoptic tradition (only 1:4 and 3:29 in Mk and only 26:28 in Mt), blossoms in Luke-Acts (Lk 1:77; 3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18.

XUM

woman apolelysai tēs astheneias sou (13:12) in a context where the image of freedom from bondage is highly operative, it is quite probable that apolyō is used with that connotation here in 14:4. On the other hand, it can be observed that the phrase iasato auton kai apelysen suggests that the healing is already described by iasato, and the aplysen must then refer to something else and had best be translated in the usual way, "and sent him away." Still, in the context of the narrative, it seems odd that a man should be sent from the table just because he has been healed. The logic of the plot can be saved if we interpret the action of Jesus in this way: the man was "planted" there as a test, so Jesus sends him away to avoid further embarrassment for the fellow. Understood this way, apelysen would have as its primary meaning "sent away," and then, because of the narrative situation and the nature of that Greek word, there would be a play on the secondary meaning of "release"; for in this case both the cure and the dismissal constitute a genuine release.[1]

That the motif of liberation is central to this story is still more evident in the striking coherence

---

[1] That Luke is capable of such double entendre will be seen in our discussion of anistēmi at Acts 3:22,26, where the "raising up" of prophetic vocation is used to interpret the "raising up" of resurrection.

XUM

of the imagery of Jesus' words with the situation. Just as the comparison of loosing the bent woman to loosing an animal from its stall was vividly consistent, so here too the image derives directly from the situation: Jesus speaks of releasing something from a well (entrapment in water) and he has just cured a man who was hydrōpikos (trapped by "water sickness"). Moving from that image back to Luke's description of Jesus' action reveals its appropriateness: epilabomenos iasato auton kai apelysen. As Luke uses the word typically in Luke-Acts, epilabomenos would seem to denote firm physical handling. Jesus' simple, wordless gesture of grabbing firmly and sending off is very much like the action of freeing some one who was trapped.

The Septuagint connotations of the words which describe the behavior of the observers--ēsan paratēroumenoi (14:1) and ouk ischysan antapokrithēnai (14:6)--are richly suggestive in this context and deserve discussion.

Paratēreō occurs 6x in the NT. Except for Gal 4:10, where it refers to observing days and months, it has to do with the malevolent watching of enemies: Mk 3:1 par Lk 6:7 (leaders watching Jesus to catch him healing on the sabbath); Lk 20:20 (scribes and high priests watch for the right time to hire men to trap Jesus in his words); Acts 9:24 (where it refers to the

Jews watching the Damascus gates to kill Paul). The LXX use of *paratēreō* supports the sinister connotations of this word: it turns up there 6x. See especially Dan 6:11 (where Daniel's administrative peers spy out his disobedience of the new law against prayer) and Dan. Su. 12,15,16 (the dirty old men watching to ravish Susanna); and, most striking of all as a possible conscious background to our pericope, Ps 36:12 LXX (*paratērēsetai ho hamartōlos ton dikaion*)--very much the situation of Lk 14:1-6.

Antapokrithēnai (14:6): Rare both in the NT (only here and Rom 9:20) and LXX, this word occurs in the LXX only 3x--Jdg 5:29, Job 16:9, and 32:12. The last locus is especially pregnant: it occurs just after Job's final soliloquy in response to his "comforters." Job 32:1 says of them: *Hēsychasan de kai hoi treis philoi autou eti anteipein Iōb ēn gar Iōb dikaios enantion autōn*. Now, eleven verses later, as the young Elihu begins his cycle of speeches, he refers to their unsuccessful efforts: *idou ouk ēn tōͅ Iōb elenchōn antapokrinomenos rhēmata autou ex hymōn* (32:12). Resonances with Luke: Jesus has shown himself just (and Luke is at pains elsewhere to call him *dikaios*--see Lk 23:47 and Acts 3:14) and his antagonists are silent (*hēsychasan*; cf. Lk 14:4 with Job 32:1) and are

XUM

not able to answer (ouk ischysan antapokrithēnai pros tauta, Lk 14:6; cf. Job 32:12).[1]

The diction describing the behavior of Jesus' adversaries, therefore, underscores the bad will already evident in the situation.

It has long been noticed that Lk 14:1-24 comprises an editorial unit, in that the healing, the sayings to guests and host, and the parable of the great supper are all gathered together in a banquet setting and there is a certain internal relationship of content (the rich neighbors of v. 12 have something in common with the busy property owners of the parable, and the poor whom one should invite, v. 13, are the same lot who finally come to the banquet in the parable, v. 21). But not much of a case has been made for the integration of the initial healing with the rest of this symposium. I suggest that here again, as in the previous chapter, a look at the structure of the editorial block will help us understand the connection. It is initially apparent that this material consists of some sayings (14:7-14), preceded by a healing story

---

[1] Regarding the use of hēsychasan at Lk 14:4 to describe the silence of the adversaries, there is the tantalizing possibility that Luke intends an ironic double meaning here; for the other gospel use of this word is Lk 23:56, where it refers to the sabbath rest which the women observe scrupulously. These hypocrites around the banquet table, in response to Jesus' question "keep their sabbath rest (!)."

(14:1-6) and followed by a parable (14:15-24). These divisions are indicated not only by the change in content but also by references to the banquet setting (vv. 1, 7, and 15). It will be noticed further that the middle section is broken nicely into two parts at 14:12: "Jesus said to his host." The middle part, then, consists of two parallel developments: 14:7-11 (a word to the guests) and 14:12-14 (a word to the host). The arrangement of this editorial block, then, can be schematized in this way.

A (14:1-7) The healing of the man with dropsy

    B (14:7-11) A word to guests: take the lowest place

    B' (14:12-14) A word to the host: invite the poor

A' (14:15-24) The parable of the great feast

The calculated inclusion of all four elements in the unified meal setting and the obvious parallelism of the middle members--all of this invites the reader to see if there is any way in which the outer members, A and A', relate to each other.

First, a closer look at the parable. One of the diners voices an idle beatitude: "How happy he who will eat bread in the kingdom of God!" (14:15)

Jesus' response is a story which shows that pious statement to be idle, because the whole point of the parable is that *the invitation is out* (*ēdē hetoima estin*, 14:17), and those who are hypnotized by possessions and personal concerns are missing it. (In this respect the "beatitude" of 14:15 is analogous to the idle questions of 10:29; 13:23 and 17:20--all of which Jesus answers by an existential challenge.)[1] Reading this parable in conjunction with the healing of the man with dropsy shows that there is indeed a connection. The point is the same as that of the previous chapter: to those who can read the signs of the present, the time is now. The invitation is out. The people who would stand in the way of a healing because of a sabbath law are like the people whose mundane preoccupations distract them from the banquet. When, in the parable, the master of the house learned that his invitation had been rejected, he was furious. Similarly, when Jesus, in the healing account, perceives the heartless response to his inviting question (14:3), he acts with the abruptness of an angry man: *epilabomenos iasato auton kai apelysen*.

---

[1] Jesus' answer to the Pharisees at 17:20 is especially pertinent to this context: "The kingdom of God does not come *meta paratēreseōs*." Cf. the description of the witness of the healing of the dropsical man as *ēsan paratēroumenoi*. Their "spying out" attitude prevented them from seeing the reign of God present in the encounter with Jesus.

Like the parable, the healing is a clash between invitation and rejection. It becomes clearer now why the words of advice in the middle section are called a *parabolē* (14:7), for they are not bits of literal etiquette but models of the attitude necessary for openness to the invitation to the banquet of the kingdom, an invitation which his healing presence now represents. Placed in this context, then, the healing action of Jesus becomes itself a *parabolē*. As in the healing of the bent woman, the issues are embodied in the action of the encounter.

3. The Grateful Samaritan Leper (17:11-19)

To get on to the question of the larger editorial unit, let us accept, for the moment, H. D. Betz's interpretation of this pericope. Betz sees the point of the account in the contrast between the superficial response of the nine who were indeed healed but not "saved" and the response of the grateful Samaritan, who "sees" that he is healed, i.e., he understands it and, therefore, praises God and honors Jesus.[1]

A look at the larger editorial context reveals that here, too, Luke's arrangement of the material suggests interpretive connections with the healing narrative. In the material which precedes the healing story, Luke presents some sayings on the power of *pistis* (17:5f) and a parable on the importance of acknowledging a gratuitous relationship with God (17:7-10). This section is intimately related with the healing in that the story of the ten lepers demonstrates that the faith which saves is that which gratefully acknowledges the healing power of God in Jesus. As for the material which follows the healing, it interprets the healing insofar as it proclaims that the presence of the reign of God is available now (*entos hymōn*, 17:21) to those who, like the Samaritan, have the faith to see it (17:15); whereas it is not visible to those who, like the Pharisees, try to spy it out (*Ouk erchetai hē basileia tou theou meta paratērēseōs*, 17:20). I suggest that the usual translations of *meta paratērēseōs* (RSV: "with signs to be observed"; NEB: "You cannot tell by observation when . . .") miss the ironic punch of the Greek word. For *paratērēsis* is the noun form of the verb *paratēreō*, which, as we observe above, has everywhere in Luke-Acts (and in the LXX) a sinister meaning. It is the defensive scrutiny of those who seek to manipulate. And in two of the Lucan healing accounts, it describes the spying out of the enemies of Jesus--the scribes and Pharisees who watch to see what he does with the man

---

[1] H. D. Betz, "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Lk 17:11-19)," *JBL* 90 (1971):314-328.

XUM

with the withered hand (Lk 6:7) and those present at the table of the Pharisee to see what he does with the dropsical man (14:1). The kingdom of God is not available to those who would try to "check it out" in that uncommitted way. Understood in this light, the message of the eschatological discourse of 17:20ff may simply be this: you can participate through faith in the presence and power of the kingdom right now; but don't confuse youself with apocalyptic speculations about the when and where of the _end_. The end is something else and you won't know the when and where of it until _after_ the fact (as, for example, after the fact of death, when you can quite easily locate the corpse by watching for the vultures [see 17:37]).

F. _A Pattern of Responses_

Ever since Dibelius[1] called attention to the response of the spectators at the healings by isolating that reaction as a formal feature termed the "choral response," commentators have continued to underscore that element. What has not been sufficiently noticed, however, is that in Luke these responses are part of a climactic literary structure which peaks at the crucifixion and extends (as will be argued in a later chapter) into Acts. In the Third Gospel, these responses seem to draw together three periods: (1) the Galilean ministry (9:43), (2) the journey to Jerusalem (19:37), and (3) the Jerusalem events.

---

[1] M. Dibelius, _From Tradition to Gospel_ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.; first published in 1919 as _Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums_), p. 57.

1. The Galilean Ministry

Having heightened the setting of the healing of the paralytic, in ways described above, Luke ends the account, like Mk 2:12, with a choral response, which is the third in a series of that gospel's thematic "today" sayings (see also 2:11; 4:21; 13:32f; 19:9; and 23:43)--"We have seen strange things [paradoxa] today" (5:26). Later, in response to the raising of the widow's son at Nain, "Fear seized them all; and they glorified God saying, 'A great prophet has risen among us!' and 'God has visited his people.'" The first saying catches up what has gone before, picking up the prophetic identity first stated at Lk 4:18f; the second saying, with its episkepsato (elsewhere in the Third Gospel used only at 1:68,78) places Jesus' action within the broad celebration of God's saving work which is the Benedictus. Both sayings prepare the way for Jesus' answer to the question of John the Baptist (7:18-23). But still another level of response is reached at 9:43, after the healing of the epileptic boy. Here he adds to the synoptic tradition, "And all were astonished at the majesty [megoleiotēti] of God." The agency of God as Jesus' healing work is again asserted. The second sentence of v. 43 introduces a comment on the whole mission of Jesus:[1] "But while they were all marvelling at everything he did (pasin hois epoiei), he said, 'Let these words sink into your ears; for the Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men'"(9:44). Luke's joining this truncated[2] passion prediction so closely with the global response to the Galilean healing ministry suggests that the significance of the healings ultimately requires the context of the cross.

2. The Journey to Jerusalem

The journey section also contains three choral responses to healings. First, closing the story of the stooped woman, Luke writes: "As he said this, all his adversaries were put to shame; and all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things he did (pas ho ochlos echairen epi pasin tois endoxois tois genomenois hyp' autou)" (13:17). Here the response is reported with a strange word, endoxois, which has pregnant LXX connotations (see Ex 34:10 and Dt 10:21) and, because of the plural, seems to refer to more than the immediate incident. Second, at 18:43, Luke alone (cf. Mk 10:52 and Mt 20:34) reports the reaction of the spectators to the healing of the blind man of Jericho, "And all the people, when they saw it, gave praise to God." Third, at the entry from the Mount of Olives, Luke alone among the synoptists turns the shouts of the crowd into a response to the whole preceding ministry: ". . . the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen . . ." (19:37b). Just a 9:43 wraps up the Galilean stage just before the central journey commences at 9:51, so this response at 19:37 culminates the whole of the period of the mighty works in Judea (in Luke's sense of the whole of Palestine; see Lk 4:44; 23:5; and Acts 10:37), before the occupation of the temple begins the Jerusalem section.[1]

---

[1] P. Schubert notes this in "The Structure and Significance of Lk 24" in W. Eltester, ed., Neutestamentliche Studien fur Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1954), p. 182. See also H. Flender, Luke the Theologian, p. 125.

[2] The reference to the resurrection is omitted. Cf. Mk 9:31 and Mt 17:23.

---

[1] John portrays the crowd's chorus on this occasion as a response to the climactic sign which was the raising of Lazarus. John 12:17f: "The crowd that had been with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb and raised him from the dead bore witness. The reason why the crowd went to meet him was that they heard he had done this sign."

3. The Jerusalem Events

Finally, in addition to 9:43 and 19:37, there is a final choral response to Jesus the healer--the response of those under the cross. This is already implicit in the common synoptic presentation of the crucifixion. The taunt "He saved others, let him save himself if he is the Christ, the chosen one" appears in variant forms in Mt 27:42, Mk 15:31, and Lk 23:35. The "saving" referred to in the taunt must, on the immediate narrative level, refer to the healings, the kind of saving that Jesus has been doing up to this point, and the form of physical rescue which provides the taunt with its ironic content. From the perspective of the resurrection, of course, there is a double irony: that of the taunt (the healer is now victim) and that of faith (the victim heals). It is the latter aspect, according to which we may call Jesus the hanged healer, which Luke heightens by means of the chorus of responses he presents under the cross.

The evangelist does this in two ways: (1) he repeats the taunt twice (23:37,39), and (2) he elaborates the *dramatis personae* under the cross. Mark's "those who passed by" (15:29), "chief priests . . . with the scribes" (v. 31), "those who were crucified with him [*synestaurōmenoi*], (v. 32), "bystanders" (v. 35), "the centurion" (v. 39), the two Mary's and Salome--all of

XUM

these provide a wide group of spectators; but Luke enriches the chorus still further. "And the people (ho laos) stood by watching . . ." he adds at 23:35a. Mark's "chief priests and scribes" become hoi archontes.[1] Luke adds the soldiers among the mockers at v. 36. He transposes mention of the inscription to v. 38, thereby providing a mute rebuttal to the taunts. And as for the two criminals, of whom it is simply recorded in Mark and Matthew that they also reviled him (Mk 15:32; Mt 27:44), Luke has them speak. The one joins the banter in seeing only one aspect of the hanged healer (the savior as victim): "Are you not the Christ" Save yourself and us." The other man sees the other side of the irony (the victim still saves and is indeed the Christ of God), and he responds by acknowledging Jesus' kingship. As in the case of Zacchaeus (19:9), his response is met with a gift of "salvation today" (23:43). Upon Jesus' death the centurion is said to praise God (edoxazen ton theon, 23:47) and declare his innocence. At this point (v. 48 makes a kind of inclusio with v. 35), Luke introduces the multitudes looking on; they beat their breasts (like the publican who went home justified, Lk

---

[1] Luke seems to consistently portray a division between the "rulers" and the "people" (see Acts 3:17; Lk 7:29f).

18:13) and returned (hypestrephon).[1]

In summary, we have in the responses under the cross a chorus of responses. As in his healings, Jesus was a sign of contradiction, drawing both acceptance and rejection, so now as hanged healer he is a sign; the radical responses are embodied in the speech of the two malefactors crucified with him. It would seem that this way of viewing the Lucan presentation of the scene under the cross has been prepared for by the responses to the healings and, in particular, those global comments at 9:43 (where the second passion prediction is starkly bound with the wonder at his miracles) and 19:37 (where, before the final drama of Jerusalem begins, those around are split into two camps--the disciples who "begin to rejoice and praise God for all the mighty works they had seen" and the Pharisees (19:39) and those of Jerusalem who "did not know the time of [their] visitation" (19:44)).

G. Summary: What We Have Learned of Luke's Method

Even so brisk a review of the healing accounts of the Third Gospel is enough to reveal that the evangelist is dealing with the tradition both carefully and creatively. We found

---

[1] A sign of conversion? The use of hypostrephō at 17:15,18 (the returning of the leper who saw that he was healed) gives this word an extra dimension. At least this is not a mocking crowd. And it returns doing what the justified publican did (18:13).

1. an interest in the theme of liberation
   - in the motif of release in the accounts of the bent woman and the dropsical man;
   - in the emphasis on sabbath day healings (to the two Marcan sabbath healings, Luke adds two more, the bent woman and the dropsical man;
2. a concern for the theme of restoration:
   - The Gergesene demoniac (the explicitly naked, homeless exiled one goes home, clothed, to preach);
   - the widow of Nain's son restored to his mother (7:15b);
   - the epileptic boy restored to his father (9:42b);
3. the use of the words whose Septuagintal connotation is especially suggestive:
   - prosdokaō (5:1; cf. LXX Dt 32:2; Ps 68:21; 103:27; 118:166);
   - megaleiotēs (9:43; cf Jer 40:9 LXX);
   - anorthoō (13:13; cf. LXX 2 Sam 7:13,16,26; Ps 17:36; 19:7ff; 144:14; 145:76ff; Jer 10:12; 40:2);
   - endoxa (13:17; cf. Dt 10:21; Ex 30:10);
   - paratēreō (14:1; cf. 6:7; cf. LXX Dan 6:11; Ps 36:12);
4. the use of diction (some of it Septuagintal) thematic to Luke-Acts as a whole:
   - sōzō (8:36,50; 17:19; cf. 7:50; 8:12; 13:23; 23:35,37,39);
   - dynamis (4:36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; cf. 1:17; 1:35; 4:14; Acts 1:8; 3:12; 4:7);
   - doxazō (5:12; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43; cf. 2:20; 4:15; 23:47; Acts 4:21);
   - sēmeron (5:26; cf. 2:11; 4:21; 13:32f; 19:5,9; 23:43);

- *anorthoō* (Lk 13:13; Acts 15:16);
- *paratēreō* (Lk 6:7; 20:20; cf. *meta paratērēseōs* at 17:20):
- *apolyō* (13:13; 14:4; cf. 6:36; 8:38);
- *episkeptomai* (1:68,78; 7:16);
- *ēchos* (4:37; 21:25; Acts 2:2);
- *anakyptō* (13:11; 21:28);
- *prosdokaō* (3:15; 7:19,20; 12:46);
- *parachrēma* (passim, in Luke-Acts almost exclusively in NT; chiefly describing the suddenness of the healings);

5. an emphasis on *the unity of word and work*:

   - *logos*, describing both teaching and exorcism (4:32,36);
   - a healing setting for the sermon on the plain (6:18);
   - healing joined with teaching about the kingdom in the setting for the feeding of the five thousand (9:11);
   - description of the people coming to hear and be healed after the leper cure (5:15);
   - the missionary charges to preach and heal (9:1f; 10:9);
   - the global descriptions of Jesus' ministry (4:43, where a day spent mainly in healing is described as preaching the good news; 24:19; Acts 2:22);

6. a concern to underscore the actions of Jesus as "theurgy"--at bottom, the *work of God*; e.g.:

   - Jesus' withdrawal in prayer before climactic moments involving healing (5:16; 6:13);
   - Jesus' operating with a *dynamis* more than his own (4:36; 5:17; 6:19);
   - Jesus and *ho theos* mentioned in close juxtaposition (8:39; 9:42; cf. Acts 2:22; 10:38);
   - Jesus the healer present under the aspect of prophet (4:18ff; 5:17; 24:19);

XUM

7. finally, the packaging of the healings in larger editorial units, mainly in the service of eschatology and christology as seen in
    - the Lucan version of the Capernaum "day" (now prefaced by the Nazareth account, with its thematic use of Is 61 at Lk 4:18f);
    - the chiasm surrounding the bent woman;
    - the parabolic material associated with the dropsical man;
    - the triptych of rich ruler/blind man/Zacchaeus;
    - the larger rhythm of choral responses (especially 9:43; 19:37; and the group under the cross).

The overwhelming impression is that we are dealing with an author who is in total control of his material, who can rework creatively traditions he respects greatly, and who is quite conscious of the narrative flow of his work. And his handling of the healing accounts suggests that for him they are not simply reminiscences of what Jesus did once upon a time but also paradigms of the present action of the Kyrios risen.

XUM

CHAPTER TWO

ACTS 3:1-11[1]--THE HEALING OF THE TEMPLE BEGGAR

Having surveyed Luke's handling of the healing materials in the Third Gospel, we are led to suspect that he will tell the first full healing narrative of Acts in a manner which illumines--and is illumined by--the immediate context, as well as the larger scope of Luke-Acts. It remains to be seen whether examination of text and context confirms that suspicion. The task of the present chapter will be to listen to the narrative in itself. The succeeding chapters, then, will explore how the story relates to the immediate context and the larger thematic fabric of the two-volume work.

We begin with a line-by-line analysis of textual and lexical issues that can be discussed briefly. There follows, then, a series of more lengthy discussions of some historical and literary questions raised by these eleven verses.

---

[1] The account of the healing of the cripple, as a narrative unit, clearly ends at 3:10, the response of the bystanders. But because textual and hermeneutical problems connected with v. 11 are so much involved with our discussion of vv. 1-10, it will be convenient for the purposes of this chapter to treat v. 11 together with vv. 1-10.

A. *Notes on the Text*

Vv. 2:47-3:1 *epi to auto. Petros de*: The D scribe, apparently in an effort to make a smoother transition (and perhaps to set off the Christian community from the Judaic),[1] has *epi to auto en tē*$_i$ *ekklesia*$_i$*. En de tais hēmerias Petros*. The *lectio difficilior* of p^{74} is to be preferred.[2]

V. 3:1: "Now Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour." D interpolates *to deilinon* ("the afternoon") after *to hieron*. It is an untypical phrase in Luke and it is redundant in company with the mention of the ninth hour. Haenchen, *in loc*., observes that in Ex 29:39 the evening Tamid sacrifice is designated *to deilinon* ("the afternoon one") and that this probably accounts for D's addition here. It is also a sign that the OT associations were still available to a 5th- (or 6th?) century scribe.

---

[1] See Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), pp. 118, 106ff.

[2] And such is the judgment of the editorial committee of the United Bible Societies. See Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971)--hereafter referred to as Metzger.

kai Ioannēs: Against the suggestion that the John of this incident is John Mark, Moulton[1] notes that "in each new incident where Luke mentions John Mark (12:12; 12:25; 15:37) he is careful to mention his surname to avoid confusion, and he almost certainly means the apostle here. An Apostle is more likely to be concerned than a subordinate, both with this first healing miracle and with an official visit to the new Christians in Samaria." Regarding John's mute presence in this pericope, see on v. 4 and the longer note below on the place of John in Luke-Acts.

eis to hieron: both the designation (the temple buildings proper? or the temple precincts as a whole?) and the curious reiteration of progress into the temple (6x in 10 verses) are items that will be discussed at greater length below.

tēn hōran tēs proseuchēs tēn enatēn: as most commentators observe[2] the usual prayer time was that of the evening Tamid (see Dan 9:21; Judith 9:1; Jos Ant XIV 65; Bill II 696ff). Danby's note to the chapter heading, Tamid, in his edition of the Mishnah: "Lit. 'continuous,' i. e., the continual or Daily Whole-offering, brought every day throughout the year, morning and evening (Ex 29:38-42; Num 28:1-8)."[1] The notice of the ninth hour may be Luke's stylized elaboration; the events of Pentecost are said to have happened around the morning hour of prayer (2:15), and both Cornelius' vision (10:3) and his encounter with the word of God and the outpouring of the Spirit (10:30) are said to happen at this privileged ninth hour. Luke may well want to link these important moments of new beginnings by tying them together with references to the traditional moments for communication with God. The observation of Foakes-Jackson,[2] that it is odd that the lame man's helpers should wait till midafternoon to bring their friend on the scene to beg, alerts us to a feature of the narrative which heightens the probability that the time notice is artificial.

---

[1] H. K. Moulton, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Mysore City, India: Wesley Press, 1957), p. 96.

[2] E. g., Haenchen, Conzelmann, *in loc*.

V. 2: "And a man lame from birth was being carried, whom they laid daily at that gate of the temple which is called Beautiful to ask alms of those who entered the temple."

---

[1] H. Danby, ed., The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes (Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 582.

[2] Foakes-Jackson, F. J., The Acts of the Apostles (N. Y.: 1931), p. 25.

chōlos ek koilias mētros autou: in his discussion of semitisms in Acts, Wilcox decides that this phrase is rather a Septuagintism, pointing out that *ek koilias mētros autou* occurs twice in the LXX, in Ps 21 (22):11 and Is 49:1. The same phrase describes the infirmity of the first person to be healed (or the first one narrated in Acts, at least) by Paul (Acts 14:8). Again, the question can be raised, whether Luke is drawing a deliberate parallelism between two significant events (here the inaugural healings of his two major fitures). It must be admitted, though, that even if the note if artifice and not coincidence, it may well be the Pauline healing which has been patterned to match the Petrine.

hyparchōn: D, the Old Latin, and Lucifer omit this word. Perhaps they thought it redundant. Since, however, it is so typical of Lucan style, it is to be retained (see, for example, Lk 8:41; 9:48; 11:13; 16:14; 23:50; Acts 2:30; 7:55).

pros tēn thyran tou hierou tēn legomenēn Hōraion: note that what is called a *thyra* here (the usual word for door, BAG) is, eight verses later, called a *pylē*. Luke uses both words elsewhere throughout Lk-Acts--*pylē* four times, always for city gates (Lk 7:12, Nain; Acts 9:24, Damascus; 12:10, Jerusalem; and 16:13,

XUM

Philippi) and thyra twelve times, mainly for prison doors, once for the gates of the temple (Acts 21:30), but also 3 times in parables in the gospel (Lk 11:7, the importunate neighbor; 13:24,25, an "eschatological" door), and in the striking metaphor of Acts 14:27: "They . . . declared all that God had done with them and how he had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles." The vexed question of where this gate is to be located will be taken up in an extended note below.

V. 3: "Seeing Peter and John about to go into the temple, he asked for alms."

hos idōn . . . This is a relative clause which is functionally a main clause introduced by a relative--a mannerism which Haenchen itemizes as one of Luke's peculiarities of style.[1]

Regarding the verbs of looking in verses 3 through 5, there are a series of textual variants which should be noted. In the revision of the Bezan scribe, the beggar becomes the subject of atenizo. Metzger describes the situation succinctly:

> The usual text reads, "Seeing (hos idōn) Peter and John about to go into the temple, he [the lame man] asked . . . . And Peter directed his gaze (atenisas) at him, with John, and said, "Look at

---

[1] Haenchen, p. 77

> us" (*blepson*). And he fixed his attention (*ho de epeichen*) upon them . . . ." Codex Bezae rewrites the passage using the verb *atenizein* of the lame man: *houtos atenisas tois ophthalmois autou kai idōn. . . . emplepsas de ho Petros eis auton syn Ioannē*$_i$ *kai eipen Ateneison eis hēmas ho de ateneisas autois. . . .*
>
> These changes are especially curious in view of the fact that in stories of miracles it is usual to employ *atenizein* of the person who effects the cure.[1]

E. Epp adduces this D-text variant as part of the evidence for his thesis that the D-text enhances the apostles as leaders of the church as part of an anti-Judaic *Tendenz* which he finds in Codex Bezae.[2] Then, too, the D scribe may have thought that the story as it stood did not sufficiently convey faith on the part of the beggar, and so he strove by means of ascribing to the lame man the intensity of looking, to suggest something of the faith mentioned later in Peter's speech at Acts 3:16. See, too, the faith explicitly ascribed to the other man born lame at Acts 14:9 (where it should also be noticed that *atenisas* is again the gaze of the healer).

V. 4: "And Peter directed his gaze at him, with John, and said, 'Look at us.'"

syn tō$_i$ *Iōannē*$_i$: the place of John in this pericope, and in Luke-Acts generally, will be treated in a note below; here it will suffice to observe, with Bauernfeind,[1] that the presence of John in this verse is intrusive on both the syntactic and the narrative levels (removing syn tō$_i$ Iōannē$_i$ smoothes out the text, and you can't stare at two men that way).

---

[1] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 307.

[2] Epp, *Theological Tendency*, pp. 155f, 164.

V. 5: "And he fixed his attention upon them hoping to receive something from them."

epeichen autois: "fixed his attention upon them" (BAG, sub voce).

V. 6: "But Peter said, 'I have no silver and gold, but I give you what I have; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk.'"

argyrion kai chrysion ouch hyparchei moi: Conzelmann (Apostelgeschichte, in loc.) sees the phrase as redactional, alluding to 4:32ff and preparing for 5:12ff. Bauernfeind and Degenhardt[2] see here an underlining (either by Luke or by the Jerusalem community) of the poverty of the pillar apostles. Haenchen[3] finds the words extraneous to the healing story and asserts that the point is the impressive antithesis (not the poverty). J. Kürnizger[1] reminds us here of the hyperbolic nature of the phrase "silver and gold." It is not that the beggar was expecting silver and gold (he had smaller coinage in mind); the point is that what Peter has to offer is greater even than the cripple's wildest dreams. Whether on the level of Peter, the tradition, or Luke, the point is indeed the antithesis. In an extended note below we shall see how the OT associations of "silver and gold" provide a background which heightens that antithesis in a way remarkably coherent with the thematic development of this part of Acts.

---

[1] Die Apostelgeschichte, THNT 5 (Leipzig, 1939), in loc.

[2] Hans-Joachim Degenhardt, Lukas/Evangelist der Armen (Stuttgart: Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk Stuttgart, 1965).

[3] Acts, p. 201.

ouch hyparchei moi: "We can take *hyparchō* in its full sense here, of what one has in store: 'I do not possess.'" (Bruce, *in loc*.). Coming just four verses after the blander use of *hyparchō*, where (as in 24 other places in Acts) it equals *einai*, the use in v. 6 makes a kind of punning commentary on the use in v. 2--*chōlos . . . hyparchōn*--i.e., being lame was indeed his only possession.

en tōi onomati: Because this healing is done in the name of Jesus (cf. Lk 9:49f), Loisy[2] thinks we should

---

[1] J. Kürnizger, *The Acts of the Apostles* (N. Y.: Herder and Herder, 1969), pp. 54f.

[2] Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920), pp. 255f.

XUM

understand this healing as an exorcism; but this will hardly work, since in exorcisms it is always the demon who is commanded; here the man himself is ordered. On the other hand, Loisy is surely right when he asserts that commanding in the name of Jesus is a proclamation of the resurrection; dead men have no authority.

Searching for the background that might explain this use of the name of Jesus, some commentators[1] point to rabbinical witnesses to the use of the name (*shem*) of God with miraculous intent; others[2] find an analogue

---

[1] For example, H. Robinson: "The words may possibly refer to the emphatic sense in which the Jews understood *shem* or *name* of God, . . .; and as about this time they attributed miraculous powers to its agency, Peter might probably allude to this opinion, and by using the name of the Messiah, as the Jews did that of God, seek to impress them with the belief of his Divine agency upon the person healed being the efficient cause of the cure. See Lk 9:49." Hastings Robinson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: John W. Parker, 1839), *in loc*.

[2] Especially Heitmüller: "Here one is not to supply a *legō* or a *parangellō*. Nor is one to produce an artificial connection between *en tō$_{i}$ onomati* and *peripatei*, by saying, for example that *en t. on*. indicates that upon which either the *paripatei* or the issuing of the command is founded (Wendt, 8th 3d.). The words are rather more hardened into a formula and are best separated by a colon or comma from *peripatei*: 'under the pronouncement of the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth: walk!' insofar as these words are spoken--and solemnly--what was intended is thought of as accomplished. Thereby, they have become a (magic?) formula." Wilhelm Heitmüller, *"Im Namen Jesu." Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), p. 60. [Translation mine.]

XUM

in the pagan magical use of names. These issues will be discussed later, in connection with the Lucan interpretation of this invocation of the name, at 3:16.

V. 7: "And he took him by the right hand and raised him up; and immediately his feet and ankles were made strong."

kai piasas auton tēs dexias cheiros ēgeiren auton: this description of Peter's physical involvement in the healing is striking. Only Luke's narrative of Peter's final healing matches this one for physical involvement (the raising of Tabitha: *dous de autēi cheira anestēsen autēn*, Acts 9:41). Is it simply the feature of physical contact which is part of the genre of healing stories (Haenchen, 200), or is more at stake here?[1]

---

[1] In his search for an OT instance of healing through the laying on of hands, J. Fitzmyer finds no clear examples and only one possibility. The one possibility, however, is highly suggestive. It is 4 Kgd 5:11 "where Naaman, enraged that Elisha has ordered him to wash seven times in the Jordan, exclaimed, 'Here I have been saying to myself surely he will come out and call upon the name of the Lord and wave his hand toward the place . . . and cure the leper.' But the Greek version, instead of 'wave his hand toward the place.' has *kai epithēsai tēn cheira autou epi ton topon*. This is possibly an interpretation." [F. refers to Coppens, *L'imposition*, p. 104, who interprets the MT as being a prayerful gesture towards *ha makōm* in the sense of sanctuary.] Joseph Fitzmyer, "Some Observations on the *Genesis Apocryphon*," *CBQ* 22 (1960): 284. It may indeed be an interpretation referring to a practice known to the LXX translator. (Vulgate says *locum leprae*.) What enhances the suggestive quality of the passage thus transformed is that it brings together

XUM

D-text adds *estathē kai* after "immediately." Perhaps it was deemed necessary to emphasize proper passivity on the part of the lame man. This modification calls attention to the fact that the text as it stands presents the man responding dramatically to the command. We do not have a picture of Peter hauling up a limp body.

parachrēma de estereōthēsan hai baseis autou kai ta sphydra: As we noticed in our review of the Lucan retellings of the synoptic healings, *parachrēma* is a favorite word of his, which gains eschatological overtones at Lk 19:11. The words *baseis* and *sphydra* are commonly cited[1] as examples of Luke's alleged habit of describing cures with a medic's eye. Cadbury long ago proved, *pace* Hobart, that such vocabulary was available

---

healing through laying on of hands and "calling upon the name of the Lord." (Is it not possible to understand Peter's gesture as the kind of laying on of hands appropriate for a man whose problem is immobility?)

[1] For example, H. Robinson, *Acts*, *in loc.*: "Luke particularizes the parts, as his medical knowledge enabled him to do, and hence affords an undesigned testimony ofhis being the author of the book." The summary of F. Rendall is still appropriate: "The language states with medical precision the nature of the restoration: the tread gains muscular firmness, and ankle joints new strength and play." Frederick Rendall, *The Acts of the Apostles in Greek and English with Notes* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1897), p. 88

XUM

to the educated layman of the time.[1] But the point remains that, physician or not, the narrator underscores the transformation with this detailed recital.

V. 8: "And leaping up he stood and walked and entered the temple with them, walking and leaping and praising God."

kai exallomenos estē: With a leap the man stands up. Whereas in the previous verse it is said that Peter raised (ēgeiren) him, now we have a picture of a man leaping to his feet, apparently on his own steam (estē). The event for the man is emphatically both passive and active. Luke seems at pains to have it both ways.

That first word used to describe the man's leaping, exallomai, a NT hapax legomenon, is also rare in the LXX. It occurs there six times--the actions being ascribed to locusts in Jl 2:5, horses in Hab 1:8; mountains and hills in Is 55:12, and people leaping like grasshoppers in Nahum 3:17. But the passage of Micah in which it occurs (Mic 2:12) is so richly suggestive with respect to our passage that it may well be the object of allusion: It is worth quoting at length:

---

[1] See William K. Hobart, The Medical Language of St. Luke (Dublin: Hodges, Friggis and Co., 1882; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1954); Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (New York: Macmillan, 1927; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1961).

> Jacob shall be completely gathered (*synachthēsetai*) with all [his people]; I will surely receive the remnant of Israel; I will cause them to return together (*epi to auto*), as sheep in trouble, as a flock in the midst of their fold. They shall rush forth (*exalountai*) among men through the breach made before them; they have broken through and *passed the gate* (*pylēn*) and gone out of it, and their king has gone out before them and the Lord shall lead them (*ho Kyrios hegēsetai autōn*).

Whether this prophetic end-time restoration passage is a likely candidate for Christian allusion will come up for discussion later. It should also be noted that one of the other instances of *exallomai* in the LXX--Is 55:12--also occurs in a prophetic vision of end-time restoration, Is 55:1-13, a passage, moreover, which is clearly alluded to in another part of Acts (Acts 13:34/Is 55:3).

kai periepatei: the imperfect pictures continuous action: he was walking around.

kai eisēlthen syn autois eis to hieron peripatōn kai hallomenos kai ainōn ton theon: Conzelmann's conjecture is reasonable: "[Verse] 8b seems overloaded and appears for the redactional verse 11, and is therefore itself redactional."[1] Regarding *hallomenos*, it is a commonplace among commentators[2] to observe that the word may

---

[1] Hans Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1972), *in loc*.

[2] See for example B. Weiss (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhanglung, 1893]), Haenchen, Conzelmann, and Smith (*Acts* [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970]), *all in loc*.

XUM

be an allusion to LXX Is 35:6 (haleitai hōs elaphos ho chōlos. The verse occurs in a passage which is eschatological in Isaiah and an important topos for early Christians.[1] In the NT such leaping is ascribed to human behavior only here and Acts 14:10, where it is another man born lame who leaps after being healed.

kai ainōn ton theon: this is a phrase which Luke uses in key moments of his portrayal of open response to God. It describes the praise of the multitude of heavenly host at Lk 2:13, the joy of the shepherds at 2:20 (praising God for all they had seen and heard), the climactic choral response of all the disciples at

---

[1] The answer of Jesus to the Baptist's question (Mt 11:5; Lk 7:22) alludes to Is 35:5,6. Heb 12:12 paraphrases Is 35:3. The Nestle marginal note finds Is 35:5 reflected in anoixai ophthalmous autōn of Acts 26:18. And mogilalos is hapax in the OT at Is 35:6 and in the NT at Mk 7:32.

The Targum of Isaiah has for Is 35:6: "Then, when they see the exiles of Israel gathered together, and going up to their land, even as swift harts which cannot be restrained, their tongue which was dumb shall ring with praises." J. F. Stenning, ed. and trans., The Targum of Isaiah (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 114. Already in the MT of Isaiah, of course, the lame man leaping is intended to be a sign of the salvation of the whole people. The meturgeman of the targum by generalizing the language renders obvious what is implicit. Quite apart from the availability of the targumic interpretation to Luke, this version serves to remind us that the leaping man of Is 35:6 was an image of Israel saved, just as the impotent man of Is 1:5 (similarly generalized in the Targum) is an image of Israel fallen.

19:37 (where they echo an angelic multitude of 2:20 by singing doxa en hypsistois), and, finally, ainountes ton theon describes the behavior of the Jerusalem community at 2:47, the verse immediately preceding our pericope.

Vv. 9f: "And all the people saw him walking and praising God, and recognized him as the one who sat for alms at the Beautiful Gate of the temple; and they were filled with wonder and amazement at what had happened to him." The witness element of the bystanders' response is emphasized here. For the moment, that they saw the effects of the healing and recognize the leaper and the one who used to sit begging--these things are more important than their emotional response of wonder and amazement. By 4:21 wonder and amazement will have escalated to praise: "for they were all praising (edoxazon) God for what had happened." (In a sense, all of the rest of chapters 3 and 4 are a response to the healing.)

V. 11: "While he clung to Peter and John, all the people ran together to them in the portico called Solomon's, astounded." This transitional verse, which is introductory to what follows as much as it is subsequent to what precedes it, will be treated as part of the preceding pericope inasmuch as the textual problem is best discussed in the context of what came before. It is convenient to begin by quoting Metzger's review of the problem:

> The two forms of text of this verse involve a particularly difficult set of problems, some textual, some archaeological. Instead of the usual text codex Bezae reads *ekporeuomenou de tou Petrou kai Ioanou synexeporeueto kratōn autous, hoi de thambēthentes estēsan en tē$_i$ stoa$_i$, hē kaloumenē Solomōnos, ekthamboi*, which may be rendered as follows (the material in square brackets is not in D but is added here from the Alexandrian text in order to make sense of the phraseology of D): "And as Peter and John went out, he went out with them, holding on to them; and [all the people ran together to them and] stood wondering in the portico that is called Solomon's, astounded."
>
> The differences between the Alexandrian and Western texts involve the location of Solomon's portico. According to the Alexandrian text (a) Peter and John healed the lame man at the Beautiful gate; (b) they went into the temple (verse 8); and (c) they became the center of a crowd that ran together to them in Solomon's portico. From this account the reader would conclude that Solomon's portico was inside the *hieron*. On the other hand, according to the Western text the apostles (a) heal the lame man at the Beautiful gate, (b) they go into the temple, and then (c) the apostles and the healed man go out to Solomon's portico. This envisages the location of Solomon's portico outside the *hieron*.[1]

Because D best fits the archeological data as he reconstructs it, Kirsopp Lake holds the Western text to be the original one at this point.[2] F. F. Bruce holds D to be correct but secondary. Metzger rejects the D reading mainly because its wording is incompatible with the careful writing so evident elsewhere in Luke.[1]

---

[1] At this point Metzger refers us to the Western text of Acts 5:12, which places Solomon's portico *en tō$_i$ hierō$_i$*; Metzger calls this "clearly an interpolation" since at 3:11 D has Solomon's portico outside *to hieron*. Metzger, p. 308.

[2] *Beginnings*, IV, 53.

B. Historical and Literary Questions

Besides settling the text, there are some unresolved issues here that deserve further discussion. There are the historical questions: With what known gate of the temple can we identify the Beautiful Gate of Acts 3? Where was Solomon's Portico? Then there are the literary questions: What was *Luke's* understanding of the relationship between *to hieron*, the Beautiful Gate and Solomon's Portico? Further, what are we to make of the mute and inactive presence of John, the elaborate portrayal of the transformation, and the curious emphasis on looking and gazing? The remainder of this chapter will ask these questions of the text to help clarify the mind of Luke on these matters.

1. The Beatiful Gate and Solomon's Portico

Kirsopp Lake's extended note on this question in volume five of *Beginnings* is still the place to start. What follows is a résumé of his review of the

---

[1] "For, in addition to the need for identifying the 'they' in ver. 11 in some such way as is done in the Alexandrian text . . . the atrocious grammar of *en tē$_{i}$ stoa$_{i}$ hē kaloumenē Solomōnos* reminds one of the solecisms perpetrated by the author of the Apocalypse." Metzger, p. 309.

XUM

question. Two chief candidates have been presented--(a) the Shushan Gate (in the eastern exterior wall of the temple area) and (b) the Nicanor Gate (the gate of Corinthian bronze mentioned in Josephus' *Bel. Jud.* v.5.2f.). The Shushan is the only one traditionally identified with the Beautiful Gate. It was called *porta aurea* during crusade times (a misunderstanding of the Greek *hōraia*). But commentators dismiss this tradition as being totally without evidence and, moreover, a poor place to beg. The commentators' favorite is Josephus' gate of Corinthian bronze (which is described as the most beautiful of all and therefore likely to be nicknamed "The Beautiful"), which he identifies with Nicanor's Gate, located between the Court of the Gentiles and the Court of the Women and which the Mishnah locates between the Court of the Women and the Court of the Men.[1] But Lake observes that the Nicanor Gate doesn't fit the logic of the Neutral text, where Solomon's Porch is located within *to hieron*, necessitating that we understand *to hieron* to be the temple area, not the complex of temple buildings. And so, according to the Neutral text ~~the~~ *thyra hōraia* cannot refer to the Nicanor Gate but one of the external gates, one like the Shushan. Since Shushan is suspect for other reasons, Lake finally settles with the Western text, since D speaks of the men going out again and thereby allows to hieron to be understood as the building and permits the best historical candidate, the Nicanor Gate, to fit into the logic of the narrative.[1]

---

[1] Stauffer (*ZNW* 44 (1952/53): 44-66) holds that Josephus and the Mishnah can be reconciled by understanding the Nicanor Gate to be on the east of the Court of the Men.

As for Solomon's Portico, Josephus, in B.J., V.5.1, speaks of mia stoa which Solomon built on the east side of the naos. In view of this, Lake quite appropriately observes:

> Plainly this does not say anything at all about the names of parts of the second, still less of the Herodian temple; but if Solomon built a colonnade on the east side of the Temple, and this was older than the other colonnades, it is possible that the name of Solomon was always attached to the eastern colonnade or 'Porch.'[2]

The net result of this review of the questions, textual and historical, is that the best text, the Alexandrian, cannot be matched up with the most plausible historical reconstruction. No one yet has tried to work out a consistent reading of the mind of Luke on this matter.

---

[1] Lake suggests that the Shushan tradition supplanted the Nicanor tradition and the Neutral text is an emmendation of the Western to conform with the Shushan tradition. Beginnings, 5:485.

[2] Ibid.

Some, like Haenchen,[29] are content to observe that Luke has a faulty knowledge of the topography of the temple, but these authors do not move on to take Luke's language seriously to see just how *he* understood the setup and whether his understanding has an inner consistency of its own which deserves to be taken seriously. Let us try such a reading.

The story begins by saying that Peter and John were going up to the temple (*anebainon eis to hieron*). Granted, this is a stereotyped phrase: one "goes up" to the temple just as one "goes up" to Jerusalem, because, just as Jerusalem is higher than the rest of Palestine, the temple mount is higher than the rest of Jerusalem (Lk 18:10 uses the phrase stereotypically of the Pharisee and the tax collector). But stereotyped though it may be, the phrase as it stands at the start of this narrative presents the image of two men *going up* to enter the temple area (as even today one literally goes up when entering the temple precincts through any but the northern gate). The spontaneous image which the reader of Luke-Acts would give to the word *to hieron* mainly in the general sense of the whole holy place, the temple precincts. The *pterygion tou hierou* (Lk 4:9), for example, is best understood as the SE

---

[1] *Acts*, pp. 199, 204. See also B. Weiss and H. Conzelmann *in loc*.

XUM

corner of the walls of the temple mount; and in Lk 19:45, it is *eis to hieron* that Jesus goes to expel the sellers, and we know that they operated in the court of the Gentiles. When Luke wants to refer to the temple sanctuary, he uses the word *naos* (see Lk 1:9,21,22 and 23:45). Of particular interest for the interpretation of the word *to hieron* in Acts 3 is the use of the word in the more immediate context of our pericope. The summary statement of Acts 2:46 describes the disciples as meeting habitually *en tōi hierōi* and *kat'oikon* (the same phrase is repeated in Acts 5:42). And the summary statement of 5:12 specifies their characteristic meeting place as the *stoa Solomōntos*. If the meeting in that colonnade can be spoken of as being *en tōi hierōi* in 2:46 and 5:42, then the word is quite probably meant in that general sense in Acts 3.[1]

Thus the plain sense meaning of the words of verse 1 is that Peter and John were on their way up to the temple mount, i. e., not yet within the walls.

As for verse 2, the RSV renders it quite precisely, paying proper respect to the imperfect of *ebastazeto* and the subordinate nature of the relative clause: "And a man lame from birth was being carried, whom they laid daily at the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful to ask alms of those who entered the temple." There is nothing to indicate here that the encounter which begins in v. 3 is occurring at the Beautiful Gate. What the words say is simply that the man born lame, who was laid daily at the Beautiful Gate, was being carried. The text is open to the possibility that he was being put in place but ~~all~~ it says is ebastazeto, he was being carried. The picture we have, then, is that of two parties--Peter and John and the lame man and his carriers--meeting as the apostles are about to enter the temple area, they to worship and he to take up his post at the Beautiful Gate. The encounter of vv.3 through 7, then, takes place outside the temple area.

---

[1] The scribe who interpolated *en tōi hierōi* in 5:12 is simply working out this implication.

Verse 3 clarifies Luke's location of the gate. Having just described the man as customarily begging at the Beautiful Gate from the people eisporeuomenoi eis to hieron, he goes on to describe the man as seeing Peter and John doing just that (mellontas eisienai eis to hieron), which suggests that the man is indeed in his customary place at the gate. And when, in v.7, Peter mediates the healing, he pulls the man up on his feet, a gesture which presumes that he is no longer being carried. Perhaps, then, ebastazeto of v. 2 does refer to his being brought to his usual post, and the encounter does in fact happen at the Beautiful Gate. The point of ebastazeto, then, may simply be to emphasize the powerlessness of the man.[1]

The hieron which the three men enter in v.8 is to hieron in the same global sense implied in the four previous uses of the word in this pericope. The transition, in v. 11, to the porch of Solomon, then, is not a jarring one, for, as we have already learned from the summary statements of Acts 2:46 and 5:12, the location of this portico within to hieron is just what one would expect from Luke's notion of the layout and the words he uses to describe it.

If the modern historian's attempt to identify Luke's Beautiful Gate with Josephus' gate of Corinthian bronze is valid, then Luke's location of it in an external wall is inaccurate and the interpolation of the Bezan editor at 3:11 is understandable. But what looks at first to be simply a mistake may well be a clue to the author's meaning. Such an error is understandable in an author writing after the destruction of the temple and at some distance from the scene.[2] What Luke the historian may have been working with is (a) a story about the healing of a well-known lame man at the Gate Beautiful, (b) a tradition about the original Jerusalem Christian community commonly meeting in Solomon's Portico, and (c) a vague knowledge of what the temple layout was like. That very distance in time and space and that incomplete knowledge gave Luke the freedom to combine the fragments as he wished. In an author who elsewhere shows a sensitivity to the symbolic possibilities of narrative,[1] the movement from being powerless and paralyzed outside the temple to being healed, active, and praising within the temple--such a movement might speak more of literary intention than of historical error. Indeed, what is, on one level, an historical inaccuracy, may, on another level, embody the deepest meaning of the historical event.[2] It remains to be seen whether a fuller analysis of the text supports this possibility.

---

[1] This would be in keeping with Luke's penchant for underlining the condition of the needy person before the cure. See the demoniac and the bent woman, for example.

[2] A comparison of Lk 24:50 with Acts 1:12 suggests that he identifies the Mount of Olives with Bethany, another example of topographical ignorance.

---

[1] Note how the experience of being healed from blindness, lacking in Luke's third recounting of Paul's call in Acts 26, seems to be transferred to the future experience of Gentile converts, to whom Paul is sent "to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light . . . " (Acts 26:18a).

[2] Conzelmann makes a similar observation regarding the travel narrative: "In part I we attempted to show that the course of the 'journey' is through the same regions as the earlier 'travels,' i. e., through Galilee and Judea, and that what is new about the journey is not the change of place, but the manner in which Jesus proceeds, that is, conscious of Jerusalem as the goal, or in other words, conscious of the suffering that awaits him. This consciousness of suffering appears as something implicit in the 'journeying.' It is easy for Luke to use this kind of symbolism, of

2. The Presence of John

John accompanies Peter quite naturally in vv.1 and 3, but in the encounter, beginning at v.4, his presence becomes intrusive: *atenisas de Petros eis auton syn tō$_i$ Iōannē$_i$ eipen, Blepson eis hēmas*. The singular participle and verb clearly refer to Peter. Haenchen rightly observes that *syn tō$_i$ Iōannē$_i$* is tacked on.[1] Regarding the instruction, *Blepson eis hēmas*, Bauernfeind notes well that "it is impossible to look fixedly in this way at two men at once."[2] The mediation of the healing is in fact Peter's alone. So, from the beginning to the end of the story, John is simple present, exhibiting neither speech nor gesture. At the same time, though he is not active in the encounter--either through word or deed--his presence is clearly important to Luke. This apparent clue to the work of the author sends us back to the rest of Luke-Acts, to see if there is elsewhere evidence of an editorial concern to relate John with Peter.

---

course, as he has no personal knowledge of Palestine. . . ." *Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (N. Y.: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 193, n. 4.

[1] *Acts*, p. 199. See too, among others, Wellhausen and Loisy, *in loc*.

[2] Quoted in Haenchen, *Acts*, 199.

First, regarding Luke's treatment of Peter alone, it is obvious that Luke does things in the Third Gospel to heighten Peter's stature in preparation for his leadership role in Acts. Luke's version of the call (Lk 5:1-11) is mainly a story about the call of Peter. The prayer of Jesus that Simon's faith not fail (22:31f) looks like a setup for his role in Acts (the interesting mix of singular and plural suggests Simon's function as leaders). In other places, and in similar ways, Peter is brought in by name where the synoptic parallels have at best only an anonymous disciple (Lk 8:45; 12:41; and 22:8). Then, there are the various Lucan softenings of the hard picture that Mark paints of Peter (along with the other disciples): Luke omits Peter's rebuke of Jesus at Mk 8:32; Mark's naming of the inner circle present at Gethsemane (Mt 14:33) is missing; nor is Peter addressed as one of the sleepers (the omission of the inner circle of Mk 13 was omitted probably for another reason: Luke wants the eschatological discourse to be heard by all in the temple).[1]

---

[1] Although the denial is told virtually as it appears in Mark (except for the Lord's looking at Peter), it takes on a special irony within the full scope of Luke-Acts. When Peter, in Acts 3, excoriates the Jews for denying Jesus, one who has read the first volume knows that there must be some hope for the deniers, the speaker himself being, after all, a denier only recently reformed. Thus Peter's denial actually serves the gospel of hope for the Jews.

XUM

Luke's association of *John with Peter* deserves examination. Apart from John's posing the question about the strange exorcist (Lk 9:49), which is already present in the synoptic tradition (Mk 9:38), John does nothing of his own in Luke. Regarding the association of John with Peter, almost always, where these two names occur together, Luke's editorial hand is evident.

First, there are places where the mention of John of Zebedee appears intrusive and secondary--Lk 5:10a, for example. This call-story is mainly about Simon, whose name is mentioned 6x here, and who alone is addressed by and speaks to Jesus. This verse contains information very awkwardly inserted quite late in the narrative, apparently to establish who it is that follows Jesus in the next verse. Moreover, *esē$_i$ zōgrōn* is addressed to Simon in the singular. The account has all the earmarks of a story originally about Peter but later broadened to include the brothers Zebedee.

Further evidence of Luke's effort to associate John closely with Peter: there are three places in Luke-Acts where Luke changes the order in the lists of names from Peter/James/John to Peter/*John*/James. This occurs at Lk 8:51 (the "inner circle" at Jairus' house), 9:28 (at the transfiguration), and Acts 1:13 (the list of the Eleven). The pattern of these changes

XUM

suggests that Luke wants to bring John into close juxtaposition with Peter. The MS evidence to the contrary can be explained as scribal efforts to harmonize these notices with the usual order of the synoptic tradition. One further item: Luke names Peter and John as the two disciples sent to prepare the passover (22:8).

When John turns up with Peter in the narrative of Acts, his presence is almost "inoperative"--always Peter is the spokesman. John accompanies Peter in the healing of the lame beggar and the incidents following (Acts 3-4), then turns up with him again for the Samaritan episode (Acts 8), and then fades from the narrative entirely, only to be mentioned as a way of designating the James Herod killed in Acts 12:2. We have considered the mention of John in Acts 3:1-11; the addition of John in 4:13 is also quite awkward (Theōrountes de tēn tou Petrou parrēsian kai Iōannou). Besides the syntactic impression of afterthought, there is the narrative fact that the story has demonstrated no parrēsia on John's part. At Acts 4:19 we have the words of 19b-20 attributed to both Peter and John. This makes the speech either (a) choral speaking, (b) a summary of what the two said distributively, or (c) a speech originally attributed to Peter and now attributed to John as well.[1]

---

[1] It should be noted that the speech of 5:29b-32 is attributed to Petros kai hoi apostoloi, which in this situation seems to be a case of one speaking for all.

The editorial concern, shown in various ways in both Luke and Acts, to relate John with Peter makes it quite plausible that John's presence in the account of the healing of the lame beggar (silent and inactive though that presence be) is Luke's work. As regards Acts 3 and 4, perhaps we can interpret the awkwardness of John's presence as a sign of the editorial hand heightening Peter's authoritative role with the presence of one of the other pillars of Jerusalem (Gal 2:9). Here, again (as in the question of the gate), what caught our attention as a problem turns out to be a possible clue to the author's intention. In a careful piece of literature, after all, artifice signals meaning.[1]

3. The Transformation

Clearly there are several sharp contrasts worked out in the story--for example, the contrast between the beggar's condition before and after the healing. This is, of course, the gist of a healing story, the change that occurs. And the instinct of any raconteur worth his salt would be to dramatize the contrast between the

---

[1] Note that this is something quite other than that ancient exegetical principle which found in problems a special kind of revelation, as for example in Augustine's assessment of Jacob's lie: Non est mendacium sed mysterium, in Ad consentium contra mendacium 10.24. Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.

"before" and the "after." But in no other healing account (even the raising at Nain) does Luke spell out the contrast so vividly. In verse 2, he emphasizes the man's condition of powerlessness in three ways: (1) he describes the length and radical nature of the lameness (it is congenital--"from his mother's womb"); (2) he dramatizes his helplessness by having him carried (ebastazeto); and (3) in the extended relative clause (hon etithoun kath/hēmeran . . .) he achieves the double purpose of further emphasizing the man's needy powerlessness and establishing the fact that he was a familiar cripple on the temple scene, thereby preparing for the instant and astonished recognition by the public in verse 10. The "after" condition is portrayed with equal drama in verses 7f. Not only are his feet and ankles firmed up instantly, but he stands up with a jump (exallomenos) and walks; and words for walking (periepatei, peripatōn) and springing (exallomenos and hallomenos) are repeated in the same verse. In this story, more than in any other, we find Luke at pains to elaborate both ends of the transformation--this passage from paralysis to praise, from immobility outside the temple to joyful activity within it. This may be part of what lies behind Luke's sixfold reference to to hieron in ten verses (a refrain pointing to the goal?).

4. The "Dynamic of Attention" and the Role of the Apostles

Although the action of looking, especially as expressed by the participle idōn, is for Luke a conventional way of initiating an episode of encounter (e.g., 1:12; 5:2,8,12; 7:13;11:38), there is in this story an unusual number of references to looking, watching, and paying attention. "Seeing (idōn) Peter and John about to enter the temple, he asked to receive alms." That is how we might expect the initiation of contact to be described. The narrative continues: "Looking at him (atenizas) Peter, with John, said, 'Look at us (Blepson eis hēmas).' So he fixed his attention upon them (epeichen autois) expecting to receive something from them." In those verses (4 and 5), the concentration on gazing--especially Peter's command to look, when presumably the man is attending to them already (see v.3)--begins to call attention to itself.

Our review of the textual problems has turned up the fact that the complex of verbs for looking puzzled the Bezan editor, who switched around the verbs for looking so that atenizein is applied to the beggar; he realized something special was going on here and apparently took it to be the quality of the beggar's attention--one of faith, as 3:16 will assert. In the narrative, however, the focus is not so much upon the action of the looker as upon the object of the looking. At this moment just before the healing, the focus is on Peter (with John, present but inactive). In this way a crucial point is made regarding the role of the apostles in the mediation of Jesus' healing power. It is indeed *they* who mediate ("Look at us . . . he looked at them"), but they are clearly *only mediators* (" . . . what I have I will give you: In the name of Jesus Christ, walk").[1]

5. *The Power of the Name of Jesus vs. Silver and Gold*

Besides the mediatorial role of the apostles, a second theme is being dramatized in that statement of Peter's in verse 6--the sharp contrast between what the lame man expects (money) and what he gets (healing through the name of Jesus). This has been well prepared for. It was said of the man that he was placed there daily to beg alms (*aitein eleēmosynēn*);[2] and seeing

---

[1] Werner de Boor (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965], *in loc.*), echoes Stählin (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962], *in loc.*) in observing that Peter establishes a personal contact with a man who was accustomed to seeing-and-not-seeing many persons each day. So whatever symbolic meaning is carried by this dynamic of staring, it is rooted in the verisimilitude of the story.

[2] As elsewhere in the NT, the primary meaning of *eleēmosynē* is alms (indeed, the very English word is conjectured to derive ultimately [via L, AS and ME, according to *Webster's New World Dictionary*] from this Greek word). But if we are looking for connotations deriving from LXX usage (as in the case of *hallomai*

XUM

Peter, he does just that (*ērōta eleēmosynēn labein*); then, in answer to Peter's command to look, he does, expecting to receive something from them (*prosdokōn ti par'autōn labein*). In this way, Luke leaves no doubt as to the intensity and object of that expectation.[1]

---

and *exallomai*), the words is righly suggestive. In the LXX, *eleēmosynē* is almost always to be rendered *mercy*, and in the seven instances of the word in Psalms and Isaiah (rich lodes for early Christian Greek), *eleēmosynē* is mentioned exclusively as a quality of God. See also Dt 6:25. Ps 23:5 LXX ("He will receive blessing from God and mercy [*eleēmosynēn*] from God his Savior"--said of a pilgrim at the gates of the temple!); Ps 32:5 LXX; Ps 102:6 LXX ("The Lord executes mercy [*eleēmosynēn*] and judgment for all that are injured"); Is 1:27 LXX ("For with judgment shall her captives be saved and with mercy"--*meta gar krimatos sōthēsetai hē aichmalōsia autes kai meta eleēmosynēs*--a restoration passage); Is 28:17; Is 38:18 (prayer of Hezekiah); Is 59:16. So in Luke's Greek telling of the story, the language is capable of a profoundly suggestive double meaning: the beggar has sought *eleēmosynē* (equals alms) and he receives another kind of *eleēmosynē* (equals *mercy* from his Saving God, as in Ps 23:5 LXX and Is 1:27 LXX).

[1] Luke may well intend *prosdokōn* to suggest more on second look. The word *prosdokaō* is used sparingly in the NT (14x), and where it does occur, more often than not it carries strong eschatological connotations. In 2 Pt 3:12ff, for example, the object of the expectation is the day of God and the new heaven and the new earth. The remaining 12 uses are all in Luke-Acts and Q, and five of these are highly eschatological in their context--Lk 3:15 (the messianic expectation of *ho laos* regarding John the Baptist; Lk 7:19f (the enquiry of the Baptist's messengers: "Shall we expect another?"): Lk 12:46, par Mt 24:50 (regarding the return of the *kyrios*). These uses suggest that *prosdokaō* is virtually a *terminus technicus* for eschatological expectation in early Christian usage (see 1 Cl 23:5; 1 Mg 9:3; 1 Pol 3:2) and that therefore such a meaning was available as a secondary resonance when the word was used with another primary meaning. See, for example, Acts 10:24 (Cornelius waiting for an encounter with Peter, which

And the dramatic contrast which ensues--between the power of money and the power of the name of Jesus--turns out to be a subject very thematic to the whole of Luke-Acts.[1]

In the OT silver and gold turn up in stereotyped associations with idolatry (see, for example, Ex 20:23, Dt 27:17, and Hos 2:8 and 8:4). Ps 113:12ff (LXX) is most striking as a possible background to our saying: after asking the Lord to give glory to his name, the psalmist goes on to speak of the impotence of the idols of the nations:

> The idols of the nations are *silver and gold*, the works of men's hands. They have a mouth, but they cannot speak; they have eyes, but they cannot see; they have ears but they cannot hear; they have noses, but they cannot smell; they have hands, but they cannot handle; *they have feet, but they cannot walk*; they cannot speak through their throat. *Let those that make them become like to* them . . . [italics mine]

---

does indeed turn out to be a sign of God's end-time action) and Acts 27:33 (Paul, in a speech full of language echoing the eschatological discourse of the Gospel). All of this suggests that Luke may have intended such a resonance in his description of the lame man as *prosdokōn*, for, like Cornelius, what he waits for does in fact turn out to be an end-time blessing.

[1] The motif of the gospel being something quite other than silver (and gold) turns up in several places in Acts: To Simon, who would purchase the gift of God, Peter says, "Your silver perish with you" (Acts 8:20); at Ephesus, preaching competes with the sale of silver models of Artemus (Acts 19); and Paul, in his farewell address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts 20:33), tells how he did not use the gospel to gain silver and gold and garments from the people.

Note that Acts ends with a quote from Is 6 applying similar language to those of Israel who will not accept the word of God as preached by Paul (28:26). Again, LXX Ps 134:15 presents a similar contrast between idols of silver and gold and the name of the Lord. Whether the larger context of Acts provides a reason for seeing an idolatry motif in our pericope remains to be seen.

It is perhaps significant that another vehicle of Petrine tradition, the first epistle of Peter, carries a negative reference to "silver and gold" in contrast to the saving power of Christ: "You know that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your fathers, not with perishable things such as silver and gold,[1] but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot" (1 Pt 1:18f).[1]

---

[1] An allusion to Is 52:3, an oracle of salvation, in which the Lord promises to make his name known through a new exodus.

A. R. C. Leaney sees "the futile ways inherited from your fathers" as echoing the passover Haggadah which introduces Jos 24:2-4 with the words, "In the beginning, our Fathers were worshippers of strange gods: but now the All-Present has brought us to His Service." Leaney says, "1 Peter is, then, contrasting the ancient Jewish worship with its Christian fulfilment, just as the Haggadah, which he is transforming, contrasted its worship with that of the fathers before the time when God called Abraham." "I Peter and the Passover: An Interpretation," NTS 10 (1964):246.

It should be noted that if Luke intends an exodus allusion in "silver and gold," it is surely not intended to refer to the true worship of the fathers but rather to their idolatrous rebellion in the desert.

C. Gathering the Clues

Our study of this brief healing account has turned up a number of elements that call attention to themselves and point beyond the bare narrative. The time notice (the ninth hour) and the mute, inactive presence of John seem to intrude upon the narrative but turn out to be coherent with patterns of interest detected elsewhere in Luke-Acts. The revision of the D-text regarding verbs of looking alerted us to Luke's curious focus upon what we have called the "dynamic of attention" in this story. Reviewing of the vexed question of the location of the gate revealed that, unlike the Bezan scribe, Luke is quite at home with the picture of an impressive gate leading into the temple precincts. We found that some of the rarer words in the account had suggestive resonance in the Greek OT--hallomai and exallomai. And even the more ordinary eleēmosynē and prosdokaō took on new possibilities when read in their Septuagint contexts. The repeated mention of the temple (6x in 10 verses), the detailed before-and-after narration of the process, the role of Peter in the action--all of these elements (like the freeing of the daughter of Abraham in Lk 13) are open to symbolic meaning. It remains to be seen whether the context of Acts develops such an interpretation.

---

[1] Other elements in 1 Pt which turn up in the Petrine speech of Acts 3: resurrection, 1:3; *sōtēria*, 1:5,9; reference to the prophets prophesying the present grace, 1:10; Christ as predesignated and now, in the last days, revealed, 1:20; God's glorification of Jesus, 1:21; and the exodus motif (1:19, the lamb).

Two other leads suggest that there may be more to the "silver and gold" of 3:6 than meets the eye: (1) the Qumran fragment called the Prayer of Nabonidus (*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, trans. G. Vermes [Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967], p. 299) presents the prayer of a man who was cured of his ulcer by a Jewish exorcist who pardoned his sins; Nabonidus refers by contrast to his ineffective prayers to the gods of silver and gold. Quite apart from the question of any connection between the tradition represented by this Qumran fragment and our pericope, the use of silver and gold here is a reminder that those elements comprise a kind of topos in the OT in contexts referring to the impotence of idols. Perhaps the implicit contrast between the power of the living God in Jesus and the dead gods of the pagans lies in the background of Peter's saying. (2) A curious connection from quite another quarter: Josephus, in ch 5 of the *Jewish Wars*, states that all the temple gates were silver except the most splendid one, which was of gold. If the reference in Acts (whether on the level of Peter, the tradition, or Luke) alludes to this archeological fact, then perhaps the contrast is between the impotence of the human splendor of the temple and the power of God working in the name of Jesus. (With reference to this last item, Hastings Robinson observes, "The cripple lying at this gate seems to afford an apt emblem of the Jewish nation, surrounded as they were with many of the external glories of their dispensation, yet without any spiritual strength." H. Robinson, *Acts*, *in loc*.)

CHAPTER THREE

ACTS 3:12-4:31

THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT

We chose to concentrate on the healing of the temple beggar because it seemed that Luke has provided this healing with the most elaborate interpretive setting of all (i.e., two speeches). Having studied the pericope in itself and as compared with other Lucan healing accounts, it is appropriate now to examine the story's immediate editorial context. We shall look first at its structure, and then read carefully the text of that context to see if it does indeed elaborate the significance of the healing. Chapter four will explore the larger thematic implications, how the context mediates the significance of this healing within the total setting of Luke-Acts.

A. The Structure of the Context

1. The Articulations of the Larger Structure

Our pericope and its immediate setting (Acts 3:1-4:31)[1] fall within the narrative sweep of a much larger movement. There are many ways to schematize the progress of Acts, but a good case can be made for seeing in Acts 1 through 8:3 a major narrative unit within the structure of Luke's second volume. For if Acts 1:8--with its scheme of witnessing first in Jerusalem, then in Judea and Samaria, then to the ends of the earth--gives Luke's picture of the church's mission program, then chapters 1 through 7 comprise what might be called the Jerusalem story. But let us first scan the horizon by seeing how this Jerusalem section fits into the larger structure of Acts.[1]

---

[1] Acts 4:23ff is included with 3:1-4:22 for several reasons: (1) the assembled group is presented

Acts 1:1-11 works as a prologue, making the transition from volume one and giving the perspective for what is to follow. Acts 1:12 through 6:6 narrates activities of the Jerusalem community centered around the apostles, moving from the restoration of the Twelve to the appointment of the Seven. Chapters 6 and 7 are transitional in nature; 6:1-6 prepares for the missionary outreach through the naming of the Seven; 6:7, a summary, marks the growth of the community; and

---

as responding to the threats of the Sanhedrin (4:23-29; cf. 4:17f); (2) the prayer is a petition for more of what has happened in 3:1-4:22, namely preaching with boldness and healing in the name of Jesus; and (3) 3:1-4:31 is framed within two similar editorial summaries.

[1] The even larger perspective of the two volumes will be considered later.

6:8-8:3 (the arrest, speech, and murder of Stephen) looks both ways: it provides the occasion for the persecution which disperses the Jerusalem church (resulting in the outward mission) and, in the speech, it elaborates the Lucan interpretation of salvation history in which God unfolds his plan through a series of rejected leaders who save their people notwithstanding. There follows a sampling of the Samaritan apostolate in the narratives about Philip in chapter 8. Acts 9:1-30, with its recital of Paul's conversion and his preaching in Damascus and Jerusalem, provides a proleptic glimpse of the mission which will occupy the whole second half of Acts. And the remainder of chapter 9 (vv. 31-43), by means of a summary note on the growth of the church in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria (9:31), and the two healing stories about Peter (with their geographically hyperbolic responses at 9:35 and 42), schematically complete the mission to Israel in Judea and Samaria. Then, beginning with the Cornelius material in chapter 10, we have the story of the mission "to the ends of the earth"--starting with the movement from Jew to Gentile in Peter's domestic mission (Acts 10 and 11), moving through Paul's foreign mission, first to Jew and then to Gentile (Acts 13 and onward), and ending with his preaching in Rome. Thus far the larger schematic sweep of Acts.

Inasmuch as our pericope and its immediate context (Acts 3:1-4:31) fall more or less in the center of the Jerusalem story, it is appropriate now to examine the structure of that initial third of Acts in greater detail.

2. The Jerusalem Story

Acts 1:1-11 is a transitional prologue which summarizes Jesus' risen ministry with the apostles and introduces the scheme (Jerusalem to the ends of the earth) and theme (Jesus is withdrawn but the Spirit will be sent and thereby some of the *kairoi* and *chronoi* of the reign of God, mysteriously set by the Father, will begin to unfold).[1]

The movement of Acts 1:12-5:42 is articulated chiefly through speeches which are Janus-faced; looking backwards and forwards through the glass of scripture, they interpret preceding events and provoke the events which follow.

Acts 1:12-26. The restoration of the Twelve. The section consists mainly of a speech by Peter using Ps 68:26 (Acts 1:20a) to interpret an event, the death of Judas, and invoking Ps 108:8 (at Acts 1:20b) to determine a course of action, the election of a replacement for Judas.[1]

---

[1] This statement obviously implies an interpretation of Acts 1:6-8 which requires demonstration. It will be treated below, in connection with the exegesis of Acts 3:20f.

Acts 2:1-42: The Pentecost event, followed again by a speech of Peter which uses scripture to interpret this event as the "last days" (Joel) and as a sign of the resurrection (Ps 15) and exaltation (Ps 109) of Jesus.[2] This is rounded off by a rehearsal of the kerygma followed by summary material (2:41f)[3] portraying the result.

Acts 2:43-47: The first major summary of life in the community. It both expands vv. 41f with an idealized portrait of community life and, especially with verses 43 and 47, introduces what is to follow. For the healing of the lame man provides the first example of the apostolic wonders and signs mentioned in v. 43; and the healing may also be seen as a further spelling out of just how the Lord added *tous sōͅzomenous*.[1]

---

[1] For consistency, OT references are cited according to the LXX. Where quoted directly, the text is that of Rahlf's 8th edition.

[2] That the Pentecost experience is interpreted as a sign of the resurrection is implied in vv. 31-33--especially v. 33: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear."

[3] Although v. 42 is surely a summary description, the particle de indicates that it patterns with the preceding verse, with its correlative particle men. And so, pace Haenchen, in loc., we prefer to go with the Nestle and Aland texts, which place the division between v. 42 and v. 43.

Acts 3:1-4:31: The healing and its immediate interpretive context. After this overview, we will describe in detail what are the literary clues which signal that this section is an editorial unit. The obvious parts of this unit are: the healing (3:1-11), Peter's speech in Solomon's Portico (3:12-26) and consequences--the arrest of Peter and John and the conversion of five thousand (4:1-4); the encounter with the Sanhedrin (4:5-22); and, finally, a community prayer in the form of a *pesher* on Ps 2 (4:23-30) followed by the divine response (4:31).

Acts 4:32-35: The second major summary about community life. Like 2:43-47, this unit is transitional, looking before and after. Verse 33 is an apt description of 3:1-4:21; and verses 32 and 34f prepare for what is to follow.

---

[1] See Acts 4:9,12, where the healing of the lame man is used as a demonstration of both physical and eschatological "saving," a point to be developed later in this chapter. Regarding the relationship of summary to healing, Dibelius observes: "In Acts this technique seems to have been applied more consciously in introducing the sections of narrative. The first collective account (Acts 1:13-14) goes very uneasily at first from narrative to generalized description, but by means of the list of apostles makes the best introduction to the calling of Matthias which follows; in the same way in 2:43-47 the mention of the signs leads on to the miracle which follows." *Studies*, p. 9.

XUM

Acts 4:36-5:11 presents two concrete examples of faithful and unfaithful living out of the life-style depicted in the summary. Barnabas (v. 36f) provides the good example. More dramatically Ananias and Sapphira(5:1-11) provide the bad example; their story shows how those who fail to relate properly to the prophetic authority of the apostles are cut off from the people (a quite literal fulfilment of 3:23).[1]

Acts 5:12-16: The third major summary regarding the life in the early community. As in 2:42f and 4:33, the power of the apostles is celebrated, but it is the healing ministry of Peter which is highlighted, as if to emphasize (the Ananias and Sapphira incident notwithstanding) that the power working through the apostles is mainly for restoration, not destruction.

Acts 5:17-42. The arrest and miraculous escape of the apostles (apparently of all twelve), their confrontation with the Sanhedrin, the speech of Gamaliel, and the continued preaching in the temple--all of this rounds off the demonstration of how the apostolic prayer of 4:29 (dos tois doulois meta parrēsias pasēs lalein ton logon sou) continued to be answered.

Acts 6:1-8:3. With the appointment of the Seven (6:1-7), the arrest of Stephen (6:8-15), his speech

---

[1] How 5:1-11 is a fulfilment of 3:23 will be explained below.

(7:1-53), his death and the ensuing persecution and scattering of the city's church, the Jerusalem story, at least as a narrative focus, is completed.

B. Acts 3:1-4:31: An Editorial Unit?

Having reviewed the basic movement of the larger context of Acts 3:1-11--the Jerusalem story of Acts 1:12-8:4--we must now justify treating Acts 3:1-4:31 as an editorial unit.[1] In the gospel of Luke, we found editorial packages which both contained and interpreted the accounts of the Capernaum day healings, the cure of the bent woman, and the stories of the dropsical man and the Samaritan leper. Now we must ask regarding Acts 3:1-11 whether there is anything in the surrounding text which indicates a similar editorial packaging.

A number of factors prompt our considering 3:1-4:31 as a unit:

- It is framed, book end fashion, by the first and second major summaries (2:43-47 and 4:32-35),[2] which not only introduce and conclude 3:1-4:31 but also set it apart from what comes before and after.

---

[1] See introduction, pp.5f,n.1, for references to the treatment of our section in the history of source criticism.

[2] See the discussion above (n.3, p. 135; and p. 136).

- Like Peter's speeches of Acts 1 and 2, the speeches (and prayer) of Acts 3 and 4 interpret through scripture the events which precede them.[1] Just as Peter's speech of 2:14-39 interprets a current event--the Pentecostal phenomena--in the light of both scripture and the death and resurrection of Jesus, so Peter's speeches in Solomon's Portico and before the Sanhedrin interpret a current event--the healing--in the light of scripture and the Christ event.

- Whereas the material before and after our section speaks of hoi apostoloi (1:2,26; 2:37,42,43; 4:33,35ff, and 19x throughout the remainder of Acts), the sixty-seven-verse stretch of 3:1-4:41 refrains from references to the group under that name but portrays the apostolic power entirely in terms of Peter and (a present but mute) John. That these two are intended to stand for the apostles is indicated by the fact that what they do in this section precisely illustrates the statements made about hoi apostoloi in the summaries at 2:43b (" . . . and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles") and at 4:33 ("and with great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus . . .").

---

[1] The prayer is included with the speeches because, like them, it uses Scripture to interpret events.

- By means of the healing narrative (3:1-11), the repeated references to that event (3:12f,16; 4:9f,14,16,22), and the climactic references to healing in the prayer (4:30),[1] this section thematizes in a special way the healing power of God.

- In this section, acting and speaking in the name of Jesus is especially thematic (3:6,16; 4:7,10, 12,17,18,30).

All of these elements encourage us to look upon the healing of Acts 3:1-11 as bound intimately with the speeches and community prayer which follow.[2]

Our next task, then, is to take a close look at Acts 3:12-4:31 and see to what extent this material interprets the meaning of Acts 3:1-11. (The reciprocal question will also be raised: to what extent the healing helps interpret what follows; for we saw in our study of the bent woman, the dropsical man, and the grateful leper, that the interpretive relationship can go both ways.)

---

[1] What they pray for is indeed future, but it is a request for more of what they have just experienced in Acts 3-4 (healing performed through the name of God's holy servant Jesus).

[2] In provisionally ascribing an editorial unity to 3:1-4:31, we do not mean to argue that the whole is Lucan construction. Indeed, as others (e.g., Haenchen, *in loc.*) have observed, the healing appears to have been at one time a tradition existing independently of the speech which follows.

XUM

C. Peter's Speech in Solomon's Portico--Acts 3:12-26)

We shall now examine Peter's speech in Solomon's Portico and see to what extent Acts 3:12-26 illuminates, and is illuminated by, the healing pericope. It is presupposed throughout that the speeches in Acts--while they probably bear ancient (perhaps even Jerusalem) tradition--are, in their present form, the work of Luke.[1]

---

[1] That the author of Luke-Acts constructed speeches to suit character, occasion, and the available tradition (after the manner of other Hellenistic historians, like Thucydides) remains a well-established consensus among scholars today. The high points of the discussion can be traced in the following bibliography. H. Cadbury presents a general review of the parallels in The Making of Luke-Acts (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1927: reprinted in London: SPCK, 1961). C. H. Dodd, in The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper, 1936), discerned a scheme of Jerusalem kerygma common to the early speeches in Acts and the authentic letters of Paul. Martin Dibelius abandoned the quest for sources and reasserted the creativity of Luke in the series of essays published as Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, H. Greeven, ed., trans. Mary Ling (New York: Scribner's, 1956). In "The Kerygma," JTS 7 (1956): 25-41, C. F. Evans, building upon Dibelius' observations, challenges Dodd's presuppositions. U. Wilckens took up more thoroughly the task of demonstrating what is specifically Lucan about the speeches of Acts 2,3,4,5,10,and 13 in Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte; Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 5 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963, 2nd ed). Granting the truth of most of W.'s observations, Jean Daniélou, nevertheless, argues that ancient tradition is visible in the speeches in primitive christology which presents Jesus as instrument of God and in the use of the OT testimonia, in L'Église des Apôtres (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970). Eckhard Plümacher, in Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), has provided the most careful examination to date on just

References to the significance of the healing, then, will be taken as Luke's interpretation.[1] It is not

---

how Luke's handling of the speeches is to be compared with Hellenistic historians, and finds the author of Luke-Acts using Septuagintisms as his way of employing the Hellenistic convention of mimesis. Perhaps the most convenient recent survey of the questions surrounding the speeches in Acts is J. Dupont, "Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le chapitre XXIV de l'évangile de Luc," in F. Neirynck, ed., *L'évangile de Luc: Problèmes litteraires et theologique* [Cerfaux Festschrift] Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Louvaniensum Belgium: Editorio J. Duculot, S.A., Gembaux, 1973, pp. 329-72.

[1] Diberlius criticizes R. Schütz for seeing the speech as an interpretation of the healing: "If Schütz reads an edifying moral into it . . . this is only possible because he includes Peter's speech (3:12ff) in the story, and does not separate the author's work from the tradition." This observation highlights the fact that it is, after all, Luke's connection (not the tradition's) that we are interested in. M. Dibelius, *Studies*, p. 14, n. 27, responding to R. Schütz, *Apostel und Jünger* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1921, p. 40.

C. F. Evans' discussion of the relation of the speech to the healing is worth quoting at length here. He argues that the loose relationship between the speeches and the incidents with which they are connected makes it possible to conclude "that Luke is operating with a stereotyped form which is current as the apostolic preaching in his own day, rather than with the historical reminiscences of what the apostolic church in Jerusalem actually preached." ("The Kerygma," p. 40.) Evans' discussion of Acts 3, however, only serves to illustrate the intimate connection of *that* speech with the incident of the healing--a fact that argues more for Luke's ability as editor-author than for an *ipsissima facta et verba* connection between word and event. "The speech in Acts 3:12-26 expounds the healing of the cripple as an exercise, it would seem, of that 'power from on high' which has been already promised in Lk 24:49 and Acts 1:8, whereby the healing work of Jesus is continued in the healing work of the apostles to which such prominence is given in the Acts story. Here a closer connection is made between the sermon pattern and the incident by the use

XUM

impossible that they were also Peter's view,[1] but our interest will be in the fact that, either by construction or acceptance, the interpretation is surely Luke's. We will select for study those verses and problems which relate most directly to the healing episode.[2]

V. 12--ti atenizete hōs: as in the speech at Pentecost, Peter begins by correcting a misconception. There is an important connection with the healing pericope in that the place and function of the apostles in all of this is at issue. The mutual gazing and paying attention in 3:4f (atenisas . . . blepson . . . epeichen),

---

of the expression 'the prince of life,' the reference to faith in the 'name' of Jesus as the source of healing, and possibly by the use of a servant christology (cf. Is 53:3: with his stripes we are healed), and the reference to 'the restoration of all things.' The sermon, however, falls short of an explanation how Jesus, 'whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things' exercises his power of healing at the present time." ("Kerygma,' p. 39) We shall see that, as a matter of fact, the speech does deal with this last question. The risen Lord works through his prophetic successors. This climaxes especially in 3:26 as we shall interpret that verse.

[1] They are certainly presented as such. Thus, Lindsay could observe, "In this sermon Peter takes for his text the lame man whole." T. M. Lindsay, The Acts of the Apostles (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1884), in loc. Similarly, W. de Boor: "The 'sign' demands the 'word,' whereby the sign gives the word a special actuality. Peter has the opportunity--indeed, the duty--to say this word now." Werner de Boor, Die Apostelgeschichte (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965), in loc. [Translation mine.]

[2] For a more comprehensive commentary on these chapters, see Hanechen, Acts, in loc.

together with the words about what the apostles have to give (en tō_i onomati Iēsou . . .), was an important element in the healing narrative and served to portray the mediatorial function of the apostles. Now, just in case that point was missed, it is further elaborated in v. 12. The atenizō of v. 4 is repeated and the question of whose dynamis is explicitly raised.[1] Our suspicion that the healing story shows a special interest in the role of the apostles is here confirmed in v. 12.

V. 13a--ho theos . . . edoxasen ton paida autou Iēsoun: as in the healings of Jesus, the ultimate agent of this healing is ho theos, here named specifically as the God of the Patriarchs, a title which evokes the promises, a theme to be elaborated in the speech that follows. It is a title, moreover, which is used at Ex 3:6,15 and thereby evokes the memory of God calling Moses to lead the exodus.

edoxasen: whether or not the fourfold use of pais for Jesus in these chapters (3:13,26; 4:27,30) is to be understood as a consistent and deliberate Servant of

---

[1] The way the question is raised again at 4:7--en poia_i dynamei ē en poiō_i onomati--suggests that "power" and "name" are alternate ways of speaking of the same issue.

Yahweh christology,[1] edoxasen ton paida here is quite probably an allusion to Is 52:13. Cerfaux notes that the two words used for the exaltation of the Messiah in the early chapters of Acts (doxazō, 3:13, and hypsoō, 2:33 and 5:31) are juxtaposed in LXX of Is 52:13--ho pais mou kai hypsōthēsetai kai doxasthēsetai sphodra.[2]

Out of the narrative context, the glorification of the Son by the Father would refer primarily to the resurrection, but in the argument of the speech (it is not our power; God has glorified his Servant) it is the healing which is interpreted as God's glorification of Jesus.[3]

---

[1] This question will be taken up in chapter five.

[2] L. Cerfaux, "La première communauté chretienne à Jerusalem," ETL 16 (1939), p. 20. See also J. Wellhausen, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte (Berlin: Weidmannische Buchhandlung, 1914), p. 7.

[3] R. J. Dillon argues that the verb edoxasen cannot refer to the healing miracle since there is no comparable use of doxazesthai in reference to miracles in the Lucan work ("Acts of the Apostles," JBC, in loc.). This is simply to ignore the argument of the speech in its present Lucan context. J. Dupont is much closer to the truth when he says that "the miracle testifies that, raised by God, Jesus possesses a name capable of working wonders for those who believe in him. The healing of the powerless man thus works as a manifestation of the glorious state of Christ risen. In raising Jesus, God has shared out his power with him. Understood this way, the miracle can lead to repentance (3:19), conversion (3:26), and faith (4:4)." Études, p. 446. [Translation mine.]

3:13b-15: This dense series of relative clauses touches on several motifs of Luke-Acts. Against the judgment of the officials of the empire, the people have handed over and denied Jesus. Their action constitutes a choice of death over life: they have traded the "holy and just one" for a convicted murderer;[1] they have killed the "leader of life" (archēgos tēs zōēs), whom God has vindicated by raising him from the dead. The train of thought has apparently moved from an interpretation of the healing as God's glorification of Jesus to a statement that God has raised the one they killed. Either this last clause (hon ho theos ēgeiren, 3:15) is an incoherent intrusion, or it is somehow part of the interpretation of the healing. If it is indeed related to the initial thought (God has glorified his servant/Son in this healing), then the reference to the resurrection must have this sense: God, who vindicated Jesus through the resurrection has further vindicated him by raising (cf. 3:7 with 3:15) up this lame man in his name. It is also the context of the healing which gives cogency to the title (or description) for Jesus, archēgos tēs zōēs, for the healing is a demonstration of just how concretely Jesus leads into fulness of life (cf. the notion in the Psalms that sickness and incapacity are a kind of death).[1] All of this gives added reason for naming God as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for it was precisely under this title that God was proclaimed "the God not of the dead but of the living" at Lk 20:37ff.

---

[1] References to Pilate's efforts to free (apolyein) Jesus (Lk 23:16,20,22) are all redactional in Luke's passion, as are the references to Jesus as dikaios (Lk 23:47) and Barabbas as imprisoned for murder (Lk 23:19,25).

hou hēmeis martyres esmen: Dupont[2] notes that union of the themes of resurrection and witness is a Lucan preoccupation (see Lk 24:48; Acts 1:8,22; 2:23f; 4:10; 5:30; 10:42ff; 13:30f). The use of *martyres* here is also an indication that Peter and John in these chapters are meant to stand for the apostles. For, although Luke can use the word *martys* of Paul (22:15; 26:16) and Stephen (22:20, the Twelve exercise the office of witness in a privileged way (see especially Acts 13:31f for the difference between those who sitness to the whole "way" of Jesus and Paul).[3] This witness motif may be the key to stress on John's presence, which fulfils the biblical requirement of two witnesses.

---

[1] Haenchen, p. 206, n. 5, notices the connection between the title and the healing.

[2] "Les discours . . ." (cited in n. 1, pp. 141-42), p. 340.

[3] Claus-Peter März provides a good review of this question in *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas* (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GmbH, 1974), pp. 44-56.

V. 3:16: "And his name, by faith in his name, has made this man strong whom you see and know; and the faith which is through him has given the man this perfect health in the presence of you all." This dense and awkward sentence raises a number of questions: Whose faith is involved? What kind of faith is this? What is meant by "the name" here?

Whose pistis? Peter and John's? The cripple's? The immediate context offers no clarification. Peter had not preached to the lame man and there is no indication that Luke understands him as present at the preaching on Pentecost. So it is difficult to see how the faith of the man is meant. On the other hand, nothing in Luke-Acts suggests that the faith of the healer (or the healing mediator) is ever an issue. In these books the faith that saves is always that of the one to be healed--not the healer. Perhaps the narrative about the parallel healing of Acts 14:8ff holds a clue. Here we have another man lame from his mother's womb (chōlos ek koilias mētros autou, 14:8), who leaps up healed when he is ordered to stand up--and the same word, hallomai, is used to describe the leaping. These similarities are enough to suggest that Luke understands this situation to be parallel with that of Acts 3:1-11.[1]

---

[1] On this parallelism as part of the architectonic pattern of Luke-Acts (Acts 13-28 mirror 1-12), see Talbert, Literary Patterns, pp. 23ff.

If that is true, then a detail in this story of the cripple at the gates of Lystra may help us understand what Luke assumes about the healing of the cripple at the Gate Beautiful: here the healing is introduced by atenisas autō$_i$ kai idōn hoti echei pistin tou sōthēnai (14:9b). Perhaps Luke is making a cryptic reference to such a judgment regarding the faith of the temple beggar in his references to the gazing in Acts 3:4.[1]

Is this faith a gift or a response? None of the various efforts to straighten out the awkwardness of this verse have relieved it of its redundancy.[2] The ungainly pleonasm may simply be the result of the author's effort to maintain a difficult balance regarding faith as both gift and response. In any case, in the midst of the awkwardness the basic assertions are quite clear: the name (of Jesus) has strengthened the man; it happened on the basis of faith in the name; the faith has come from Jesus; it has given the man this wholeness; and it was all quite public: this has all happened before all of you to one that you see and know. The repetition and qualification insure that both faith and the name (person)[1] have contributed to effect the healing; to insure the relationship, the author seems not to want to mention the agency of the *onoma* without saying that it has worked *epi tē*$_i$ *pistei*, nor does he want to speak of the power of the *pistis* without saying that it comes *di'autou*. *Pistis* is for Luke both a quality of those seeking the power of God (see Lk 5:20, the carriers of the paralytic; 7:9, the centurion; 8:25, the lady with the hemorrhage; and Acts 14:7, the Lystra cripple) and a quality of those who *respond* properly to the gift of God (see Lk 7:50, the sinful woman; and 17:19, the Samaritan leper). In Acts 26:18, Luke implies the active/passive ambiguity of faith in his phrasing--*pistei tē*$_i$ *eis eme* expresses

---

[1] Baumgarten (The Acts of the Apostles, trans. A. J. W. Morrison [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1854], p. 84) W. de Boor, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 82) also understand the faith as attributed to the lame man.

[2] See Metzger, A Textual Commentary, pp. 311ff, for a review of the question.

On Torrey's assertion that Acts 3:16 is a mistranslation of an Aramaic source, see Wilcox, Semitisms, p. 144ff. W. observes that the MS tradition gives no indication that this verse was felt to be difficult. And "if the words to onoma autou are in reality an interpretive gloss upon the ambiguous hē pistis hē di'autou, they must be very ancient, one would almost think original, as there is no external sign that they were ever absent from the text."

---

[1] The meaning of *onoma* will be taken up below. But Acts gives evidence that to deal with the name of Jesus is to deal with the person. Paul, at Acts 26:9, describes his persecution of Christians as doing all things contrary "against the name of Jesus of Nazareth (*pros to onoma Iēsou tou Nazōraiou*)." Six verses later, the now-familiar self-identification of Jesus is reiterated: "I am Jesus whom you persecute." As Luke tells it, then, to counter the name is to persecute the person. Again, Peter's words to the paralyzed Aeneas, 9:34, leave no doubt as to who is the agent of the healing: "Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you" (*Ainea, iatai se Iēsous Christos*).

XUM

how people get forgiveness of sins and a place among the sanctified. The agency of God in the human act of faith is implied in Peter's first description of the conversion of the household of Cornelius. He compares that incident with what happened "at the beginning (11:15), "when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ" (11:17). ~~This~~ is an obvious reference to the experience of Acts 2. It is significant that Luke narrates these events (called here the time when they first believed) only in terms of the God-given phenomena, with no reference to the quality or expression of their faith. The gift is the focus. Similarly, in the second retelling (15:9, Peter speaks of the action of God's "cleansing their hearts by faith" (*tēi pistei katharisas tas kardias autōn*). One need not import the grace controversies of later ages to see that Luke (or his source) is careful not to dissociate the act of faith from the gift of God. Such a concern may account for the labored balancing of 3:16 (and it should be noted that 3:16 is no more redundant than most Semitic parallelism).

Since so much is made of the name of Jesus in the healing and in the interpretive verse, 3:16, it will be important to look at the use of name in the rest of Acts to see if those instances clarify Luke's preoccupation with the name in chapters 3 and 4. Two

XUM

facts are especially revealing: (1) the connection between salvation and calling upon the name of the Lord in the citation of Joel 2:32 at Acts 2:21, and (2) the connection between *that* calling upon the name of the Lord and Christian conversion/initiation.

1. In Peter's pentecostal speech, his citation of the quotation of Joel ends with "All who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved" (*sōthēsetai*, Acts 2:21). The verse before the pericope about the temple cripple refers to "those being saved" (*hoi sō$_i$zomenoi*, 2:47); the cripple is indeed "saved" (*sesō$_i$stai*, 4:9) through the name of Jesus (3:6; see 3:16 and 4:10), which name, as Peter says before the Council in 4:12, is the medium of *sōtēria* and the name in which we are saved (*sōthēnai*). Since, as told by Luke, the healing of the temple beggar is a matter of someone being "saved" through the invocation of the name of the Lord Jesus, it would seem that we are to understand the healing in the light of the Joel quote.
2. In Acts, that phrase from Joel is used both (a) in connection with Christian identity and (b) with reference to baptism.
    a. The phrase "to call upon the name of the Lord" first appears in Acts at 2:21, at the end of that quote from Joel, where in the OT the reference is clearly to God (Joel 3:5). That OT

text is, however, reinterpreted by the rest of the speech; for at Acts 2:36 it is said that Jesus is made Lord, and at 2:38 the people are urged to be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ." In the context of Acts, then, for Christians to call upon the name of the Lord is to call upon the name of Jesus. Further, at 9:14 and 21, "those who call upon the name" (hoi epikaloumenoi to onoma) seems to be a stereotyped label for Christians.[1]

(b) The name of Jesus is explicitly associated with baptism in Acts. First there is the reference at 2:38: "Repent and be baptized each of you in the name of Jesus Christ for release from your sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And when the people at Cornelius' house receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, Peter orders that they be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ" (10:48). When Paul encounters the twelve Ephesians who had only received the baptism of John, and therefore knew nothing of the Spirit, he baptized them "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (19:5). In the recounting of his healing and conversion and baptism by Ananias, Paul quotes Ananias as saying, "Get up and be baptized and have your sins washed away by calling upon his name" (*apolousai tas hamartias sou epikalesamenos to onoma autou*, 22:16).[1]

---

[1] In Rom 10:13, Paul uses the Joel 3:5 quote in the same way; the context there suggests that he interprets the Joel quote to be equivalent to Rom 10:9--"If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him up from the dead you will be saved." See too 1 Cor 1:2, where Paul refers to the totality of Christians as "all those who in every place call upon (epikaloumenois) the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

holoklērian: a *hapax legomenon* in the NT,[2] this word appears in the LXX only as a variant at Is 1:6 (in Q Syh and 710), but that context proves to be singularly apt as a background for Acts 3. For this initial passage of Isaiah speaks of Israel, the sinful *laos* who have provoked *ton hagion* (1:4) and are corporately to be compared to a sick man "in whom there is no soundness from feet to head" (*apo podōn heōs kephalēs . . . ouk estin en autō*$_i$ *holoklēria*, 1:6). The Isaian text goes on: "And if the Lord of hosts had not left us a seed (*sperma*), we should have been as Sodom and become like Gomorrah (1:9)." Elements that suggest contact between Acts 3 and Is 1: in Solomon's portico, Peter says that the Israelites (3:13) have denied *ton hagion* (cf. Acts 3:14 with Is 1:4 LXX), and that all the families of the earth will be blessed *en tō*$_i$ *spermati* of Abraham (3:25; Is 1:9 LXX), and that God will turn each from their *ponēriai* (3:26; Is 1:16 LXX). It is as if the healing of the man born lame were the acting out of the promised restoration of Israel. The LXX resonances of rare words in the healing accounts of the Third Gospel have taught us to be open to the possibility of such allusions in Luke-Acts. It remains to be seen whether the remainder of the speech supports the plausibility of such a reference in *holoklēria*.

---

[1] It is significant that the only other NT use of *apolouō* occurs in a context of baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ"--1 Cor 6:11: "But you were *washed*, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God."

W. Heitmüller, in his thorough *religionsgeschictlich* study of the cultic use of names--*"Im Namen Jesu." Eine sprach- u. religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903)--holds that the uses of the name of Jesus in Acts (especially at 3:16 and 4:30) "the name itself, used as a formula, is understood as the operating agent" (p. 232, translation mine). H.'s *religionsgeschichtlich* comparison and historical reconstruction notwithstanding, the view of Luke is far more complex than a faith in the efficacy of the bare utterance of the name. Indeed, the texts we have reviewed suggest that in Luke-Acts, to call upon the name of the Lord appears to be a kind of shorthand expression indicating the whole faith relationship to the risen Lord.

[2] But see the cognate adjective, *holoklēros*, at 1 Th 5:23, where it refers to the soundness of the whole person--spirit, soul, and body.

V. 3:17--kai nyn adelphoi: the exculpation which comes in this verse has a special irony within the full narrative of Luke-Acts: Peter has been excoriating the men of Israel for denying Jesus, but we know from the first volume that the man saying these things is a reformed denier.

kata agnoian epraxate: the motif of exculpating ignorance (see also 17:30) mirrors Luke's treatment of the apostles' ignorance in the Third Gospel (see Lk 9:44; 18:34). The transformation that was Peter's after meeting the risen Lord is proclaimed as available to "all the people."

kai hoi archontes hymōn: here we have another clue to the schematic nature of Acts 3 and 4; the distinction between the present audience (*pas ho laos*) and the *archontes* is warranted by Luke's separate treatment of each--the *laos* is addressed here and the *archontes* will be addressed in the next chapter (where the distinction between the two groups will again be alluded to; cf. 4:8, *archontes tou laou*, and 4:10, *gnōston estō pasin hymin kai panti tōͅ laōͅ Israēl*). In these two speeches Luke makes sure that the full spectrum of Israel in Jerusalem is "covered." Regarding *archontes*, it should be further noted that, as in vv. 13f, we have language found only in the passion according to Luke (see Lk 23:13, 35).[1]

---

[1] This may be Luke's way of schematizing here the sort of split response to the healing we found in the Third Gospel.

XUM

V. 3:18: Just as the speech began by explaining the healing as the action of God, now it explains the rejection and death of Jesus as also, finally within the plan of God. From beginning to end, what happens is God's scenario, though all have a measure of freedom as to how they participate in the script.

V. 3:19: Metanoēsate oun kai epistrepsate: See Acts 26:20, which shows that these two words are part of the mission vocabulary. You repent from sin and you turn toward God. That this metanois is not merely repentance for killing Jesus but also accepting him in faith is suggested by 26:18c, where it is said that release from sins and a place among the saints comes pistei tēi eis eme.[1]

V. 20: hopōs an elthōsin kairoi anapsyxeōs: To illuminate "times of refreshment," commentators[2] sometimes point to the use of anapsyxis at Ex 8:11 LXX. But this reference to respite from the frog plague does not in fact greatly illuminate our text. More promising are two independent but converging suggestions from a German scholar and a Harvard dissertation.

---

[1] For a careful review of conversion vocabulary in Luke-Acts, see J. Dupont, "Repentir et conversion d'après les Actes des Apôtres" in J. Dupont, Études, pp. 421-457.

[2] E.g., Haenchen, Acts, p. 208, n. 8.

G. Lohfink[1] suggests that the background of kairoi anapsyxeōs is an apocalyptic tradition such as that reflected in the eagle vision of 4 Ezra 11:46a, where the beginning of the messianic time is referred to with the words uti refrigeret [v.l.: refrigeretur] omnis terra, which Lohfink thinks must have been rendered in the Greek as hina anapsyxai. If such material as this provides the background, Luke would appear to be using a term from apocalyptic referring to messianic Zwischenzeit and using it to mean the Heilzeit with Jesus.

William L. Lane[2] suggests that the phrase "times of refreshment" in Acts 3:20 is to be understood in the light of an interpretation of Is 32:15 which is now extant only in the version of Symmachus, but which appears to be pre-Lucan. In this version the phrase "Spirit from on high" was translated in terms of the refreshment which the Spirit brings.

If either (or both) of these suggestions are correct, then the coming of times of refreshment is not a reference to the parousia hastened by conversion[3] but rather a way of describing conversion in apocalyptic language.

---

[1] "Christologie und Geschichtsbild in Apg 3, 19-21," Biblische Zeitschrift 13 (1969):223-41.

[2] "Times of Refreshment: A Study in Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1962.

[3] Thus, Haenchen, p. 208, who understands this verse to be analogous to 2 Pt 3:11.

apo prosōpou tou kyriou: *Pace* Haenchen, Luke does not use this phrase in its usual LXX way. It is a Semitism. So, according to Lohfink, v. 20a, *hopōs an . . . kyriou*, was taken over intact by Luke but used by him in a parenetic context different from that of his *Vorlage* (which L. conjectures to have said something like, "Observe the Law, so that the times of refreshment may come from the face of the Lord"). Luke's parenetic sense is: "Repent and enter the times of refreshment already come upon us. For that is the view of the remainder of Acts regarding the opportunity of the Jews.

kai aposteilēi ton prokecheirismenon hymin Christon, Iēsoun: Against J.A.T. Robinson,[1] Lohfink notes that the parallel use of *procherizomai* in Acts 22:14 and the *Heilsplan* of the speech argue for the meaning "pre-election." Moreover, the use of *procheirizomai* at both 22:14 and 26:16 describes Paul's appointment for a mission. It is not a matter of Jesus being chosen for the parousia (*pace* Hahn) but of having been chosen for Israel. Within the scheme of Luke-Acts, the baptism of Jesus was the designation and the resurrection the enthronement.[1] As O. Betz has observed,[2] this christological thinking is patterned after the story of David (Jesus' father according to the flesh), whose anointing (1 Sam 16) long preceded his enthronement. Regarding kai apostelē$_i$, given the immediate context of the Christ being retained in heaven, one spontaneously understands the sending to refer to the second coming. It remains to be seen from the larger context of the speech whether such indeed is Luke's meaning. Two further questions remain hanging: "How does this talk of times of refreshment and the sending of Jesus relate to the dialogue before the ascension (Acts 1:6ff)? And how is 3:20a related to 3:20b? Because of the connection between this verse and the following, these questions will be more easily discussed in connection with the "times of the restoration of all."

---

[1] "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" *JTS* 7 (1956):177-89.

V. 21: hon dei ouranon men dexasthai achri chronōn apokatastaseōs pantōn hōn elalēsen ho theos dia stomatos tōn hagiōn ap' aiōnos autou prophētōn: The phrase, "whom the heavens must receive," recalls the ascension narrative (Acts 1:9-10) and the speech of the interpreting angels (v. 11). In that account, *ouranon* was mentioned four times--as the place to which Jesus went, the place the men of Galilee were staring, and the place from whence Jesus would come just as he went. Lohfink, in *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu*, argues that the question and answer of 1:6-7 refer to the parousia. He notes that the "when" of the parousia is discussed in terms of *chronoi* and *kairoi* in 1 Thes 5:1f and that Luke must have had Mk 13:32 in mind, a text referring to the parousia.[1] Thus the outer frame of the Acts ascension pericope admits no doubt of the fact that Jesus has been taken away, the resurrection appearances are over, and he will come again as he was seen to go. But apocalyptic speculations about that second coming are discouraged. The schedule is not theirs to know (1:7) and they are not to stare at the heavens (1:11). But within that framework the core of the pericope is verse 8, which states that there is more to the Father's plan than the second coming; there is, meanwhile, the gift of the Spirit and the mission of witnessing to Jesus.

---

[1] For the Lucan interpretation of the resurrection as enthronement, see Acts 2:30f: "Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that he would set one of his descendants upon his throne, he foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ . . ."

[2] Was Wissen wir von Jesus? (Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1965), p. 67.

Within this framework, the phrase *chronoi apokatastaseōs pantōn* names that end of the end-time

---

[1] Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchung zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhohungstexten bei Lukas*, StANT 26 (Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1971), p. 258.

XUM

when Jesus returns from ouranon. But just as Acts 1:6-11 indicated that there is more to the Father's eschatological plan than the parousia, so the phrasing of 3:21 suggests that there is more to apokatastasis than a fancy name for the End. It is, after all, an apokatastasis announced by all the prophets. Before trying to relate v. 20 and v. 21, it is necessary to discover what apokatastasis means, especially what that word might mean in the prophetic context.

We shall frame our discussion around two questions: (1) what is the meaning of the word apokatastasis? and (2) when are the chronoi apokatastaseōs pantōn?

1. apokatastasis

What does the Greek word, apokatastasis, mean? Since the noun is a hapax legomenon in the NT and does not occur in the LXX, we must look beyond the Greek Bible for help. The examples adduced by Liddell and Scott appear to give no support of Haenchen's suggestion of "fulfilment" as at least one of the meanings of the word here. The items in L. and S. show that the word meant "restoration"--spatial, local, or organic. With respect to organic restoration, Hobart[1] provides convincing examples that the word was used to mean

---

[1] We do not have to subscribe to Hobart's thesis (that Luke's vocabulary contains technical terms for medicine, proving the author to have been a doctor) to profit from the sampling of medical terms which he has collected.

XUM

"complete restoration of health" and "the restoring of a dislocated joint to its proper place."

Although the noun is lacking, verb forms--*apokathistēmi* and its alternate *apokathistanō*--are used in both OT and NT. And they mirror the meaning of the noun as described above. The OT instances mainly refer to (a) healing (Jer 15:19; Ex 4:7; Lv 13:16), (b) the restoration of Israel to the land (Jer 16:15; 23:8; 24:6; 27:19; 29:6; Ez 17:23), and (c) the work of Elijah (Mal 3:23). The NT uses are similar, referring to the restoration of a man to his community (Heb 13:19), healing (Lk 6:10; par Mk 3:5, and Mt 12:13; Mk 8:25), to the work of Elijah--restoring *panta*!--(Mk 9:12 and Mt 17:11), and the question of the disciples regarding the restoration of the kingdom (Acts 1:6).

On the face of it, then, *apokatastasis* would seem to refer to restoration--organic or social. When, then, we search for the "restoration of all about which God spoke through the mouth of all his prophets from of old," three procedures suggest themselves: (a) to check out prophecies in the LXX which actually use the verb *apokathistēmi*; (b) to search the text of Luke-Acts for references to OT prophecies which contain the motif of restoration; and (c) to examine other prophecies which, although not alluded to, are likely candidates.

a. Of the OT prophecies using the word *apokathisēmi*, the following, because of their resonance with Luke-Acts, deserve consideration:

- Jer 15:18f: . . . Whence shall I be healed [*iathēsomai*]? . . . Therefore thus saith the Lord, "If thou wilt return [*epistrepsēis*] then will I restore [*apokatastēsō*] thee. . . ."

  The juxtaposition here of conversion and healing should be noted.

- *Jer 16:15; 23:8; 24:6; 27:19 LXX*:

  These are all references to the full restoration of Israel to the land.

- *Ez 17:23*: . . . and every bird shall rest under its shadow; its branches shall be restored (*apokatastathesētai*).

  This is a vision of Israel restored to the land, the passage usually understood to be a source for the parable of the mustard seed, which is one of the parables Luke uses to frame the healing of the bent daughter of Abraham in Lk 13; and we saw that a case can be made for understanding this healing as an "acting out" of the restoration of Israel.

- *Mal 3:22f*: "And behold I will send to you Elijah the Tishbite, before the great and glorious day of the Lord comes, who shall turn again [*apokatastēsei*] the heart of the father to the son, and the heart of a man to his neighbour . . ."

  This final chapter of the "last" prophet is full

XUM

of motifs in common with Acts 3-4: the name, healing, leaping, release, sending; and more will be said on this passage in the christological section of chapter four.

b. Perhaps even more important than prophecies which happen to contain the literal use of the word apokathistēmi are the prophetic texts with restoration motifs actually quoted in Luke-Acts. Among these, the most striking examples are Is 61:1-2; 58:6 (at Lk 4:18)), Is 49:6 (at Acts 13:47 and 26:23), and Amos 9:11f (at Acts 15:16).

- Is 61:1-2; 58:6 is cited at Lk 4:18 and works as a kind of frontispiece interpreting Jesus' ministry as a fulfilment of the vision of liberation and healing presented in that prophecy. It is a vision of restoration to wholeness on all levels--physical, social, and religious.

- Is 49:6b: "I will give you as light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.

  This verse of Isaiah is cited at Acts 13:47 (with respect to the mission of Paul) and alluded to at Lk 2:32 and Acts 26:23 (with respect to the mission of Jesus). It is important to recognize that the Servant Song from which this sentence derives concerns a mission of restoration ("to bring Jacob back to him, and that Israel might be gathered to him, . . . ," 49:5a). Moreover, our verse, 49:6b, is really a half-verse, whose preceding member is: "'It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel."

- Amos 9:11f at Acts 15:16:

  Here, as in Is 49:6, we have a vision of restoration--in this case, the fallen tent of David--followed by mission to the Gentiles.[1] We have already referred, in chapter one, to the possible relationship of this passage to Luke's account of the restoration of the bent woman in Lk 13.

---

[1] On this, see J. Jervell, Luke and the People of God (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), especially the essay, "The Twelve on Israel's Thrones," pp. 75-112. On Acts 15:16, he notes: "James says that Israel's restoration is already a fact (15: 16-18). The relationship between vv. 16 and 17 can be understood only as describing the relationship between Israel and the Gentiles. Luke has described the restoration of Israel in his account of the Jewish mass conversion and the establishment of the Christian congregation in Jerusalem." (Pp. 92f.) See also Franz Mussner, "Die Idee der Apokatastasis in der Apostelgeschichte," in Lex tua veritas, edited by H. Gross and F. Mussner (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961), pp. 293-306. Pp. 295f, n.7, refers to this passage in Acts 15 in the same way. See also Wikenhauser, Apostelgeschichte, p. 172, and S. Wilson, The Gentiles, p. 224.

c. Among the OT texts, not directly quoted or alluded to, but representing visions of restoration are Dt 4:28-31 (which portrays restoration from an idolatrous exile in fulfilment of the covenant promises) and Dt 30:1-5 (which presents a vision of the restoration of Israel together with the notions of conversion and healing).

It is such texts as these, then, that seem to indicate the kind of "restoration of all" meant by the apokatastasis pantōn of Acts 3:21--the end-time restoration of the people to their Lord.[1]

2. chronoi apokatastaseōs pantōn

When are the chronoi apokatastaseōs pantōn? This phrase is usually, with little discussion, equated with the parousia. Luke's handling of time

---

[1] A. Méhat, in "'Apocatastase,' Origène, Clémont d'Alexandre, Act. 3,21," Vigiliae Christianae 10 (1956): 196-214, reviews the concept of apocatastasis in patristic and popular usage in the early Christian centuries. He concludes that Irenaeus and Clement used it in the biblical sense of Acts 3:21--liberation, and prophetic fulfilment. He finds that Origen--here influenced by Gnosticism and astrology--used the word in a nonbiblical way, to express his doctrine of the restoration of all souls to an original state of pure spirit (an opinion anathematized by the Council of Constantinople in 553). Méhat calls Oepke's interpretation of the verse (TDNT 1:391) (a restoration of creation to integrity) a case of yielding to "la seduction de l'apocatastase origenienne" (p. 209).

XUM

elsewhere suggests that the reference is not that simple. Before settling upon a meaning for the phrase in this verse, it will help to look first at Luke's timing of restoration elsewhere. For, whatever may be the prehistory of the tradition used in this verse,[1] the rest of Luke-Acts justifies our assuming that this author does not transmit material unassimilated.

There is much to suggest that in the schema of Luke-Acts, the restoration has already begun:

a. At the annunciation (Lk 1:32f), Jesus is proclaimed as one who is to sit on the throne of David and to rule over the house of Jacob (i.e., all twelve scattered tribes restored);[2] Peter's speech at Acts 2:30 presents that enthronement as having been accomplished in the resurrection.

b. The same emphasis on the present regency of the risen Lord is evident at Lk 23:69, where what would seem to be a parousia reference in Mk 14:52 ("And you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven") is transformed into a reference to the present reign of Christ ("But from now on [apo tou nyn] the Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of the Power of God"). (Here Luke may be countering popular apocalyptic by christologizing and historicizing it.)

---

[1] See the Lohfink and Robinson articles cited above on pp. 158f.

[2] See G. Lohfink, Die Sammlung Israels, pp. 22-25.

c. Lk 4:21b ("today this scripture has been fulfilled in your ears") is a claim that the restoration portrayed in the Is 61 passage has at least begun in the ministry of Jesus.

d. Remarkably, the references to Is 49:6 at Acts 13:47 and 26:23, and to Amos 9:11f at Acts 15:16, imply that the restoration of the tribes of Jacob and the fallen tent of David has been accomplished and, hence, the mission to the Gentiles may begin.[1]

e. The exchange between Jesus and the apostles at Acts 1:6ff implies a connection between Pentecost and the process of restoring the kingdom. Both 1) the Jewish background and 2) the full narrative of Luke-Acts support this interpretation.

---

[1] As will be discussed in chapter four, there is a two-step scheme in these passages, which Luke appears to develop in his presentation of the church's mission.

1) Regarding the background, W. Lane observes that since resurrection (a sign of the end-time) had occurred and the outpouring of the Spirit (another end-time sign) had been promised, a traditional understanding of the eschatological program would expect the prophetic promise of Israel's restoration to be fulfilled.[1]

2) The full context of Luke-Acts implies that Jesus' promise of the Spirit and the mandate to witness is part of the restoration. The inner logic of the narrative makes this clear. The last words of the risen Lord in the Gospel of Luke are, "And behold, I send the promise of my Father (epangelian tou patros mou) upon you; but stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high (ex hypsous dynamin) (Lk 24:49)."

---

[1] In the eleventh benediction of the Shemoneh 'Esreh, thought to be prior to the destruction of the temple, the pious Jew prayed daily: "Restore our Judges as in former days, and our counsellors as in the beginning, and Thou alone be Judge over us." Lane notes that the prayer is a request for the fulfilment of Is 1:26. (Lane, "Times of Refreshment," p. 136.) Regarding Jesus' reply, he observes: "The mild rebuke in Jesus' answer is directed not to men who hold an erroneous view of the kingdom, but to men with an excessive curiosity concerning the eschatological time-table, on a point which was not explicitly revealed or ascertainable." (Lane, p. 141.)

XUM

Our search for what that might mean in the movement of the Third Gospel takes us to 12:32 and 22:29f. For in 12:32, we have the first mention of a promise gift of the Father: "Do not fear little flock, for it has pleased your Father to give you the kingdom." And in 22:29f, we have another reference to the promise of the kingdom: "And I assign (diatithemai) to you, as my Father assigned to me, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This is best understood as a reference to leadership of end-time Israel--the Jerusalem Christian community.[1]

These two texts (Lk 12:32 and 22:29f) prepare the reader to associate the basileia with the epangelia of 24:49.

The beginning of Acts adds a new note. In the context of speaking of the basileia tou theou (Acts 1:3), the risen Jesus repeats the charge to wait for the promise of the Father (already associated with the basileia in Lk 12:32 and 22:29f) and now adds the promise of baptism in the Holy Spirit. Given this preparation, the question of the apostles at 1:6 is quite in order: "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" And Jesus' response does not deny the appropriateness of their notion of the restoration of the kingdom but simply informs them that the end-time schedule is in the Father's control and not Jesus' to reveal. In this context, the coming endowment of the Spirit is to be understood, not as an alternative to the restoration of the *basileia* but as a moment (one of the *kairoi*) of its unfolding.

---

[1] See the essay by Jervell indicated in n. 1, p. 166 above.

f. The preoccupation with choosing a replacement for Judas can be understood as a concern of the Jerusalem community (or of Luke) to establish its identity as the eschatological Israel restored.[1]

---

[1] L. Keck, in *Mandate to Witness* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972), p. 36, suggests that the Jerusalem community's interest in restoring the number 12 stems from its conviction that it was the fulfilment of the Jewish hope that in the end-time all Israel would be reconstituted and reunited. "This would include not simply all the Jews scattered throughout the world but also the so-called 'lost tribes' which had been absorbed into the peoples of the ancient Near East. Therefore, when the church insisted that it must have twelve apostles, it claimed, in a symbolic way, to be

XUM

All of the above items suggest that Luke presents the end-time restoration as beginning to unfold in the times of Jesus and the church. Let

---

this final Israel, the goal of God's purpose for his people." See also J. Schmitt, "L'église de Jerusalem, ou la 'restauration' d'Israel," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 27 (1953):209-218. Schmitt sees this theme borne out in the early chapters of Acts especially in the Deuteronomic references. He understands the *apokatastasis pantōn* as referring primarily to the restoration of the people to its initial condition (p. 216). He takes as the main clue for this interpretation the citation of Dt 18:15,19 in Acts 3:22f. The reasoning seems to be this: if Dt 18:15ff is cited as a sample of prophetic proclamation of the *restoration of all*, then those who listen to the new prophet like Moses must be the new assembly (*ekklēsia*, see Dt 18:16).

It should be remembered at this point that, according to the Lucan picture of the church's beginnings, many Jews do listen. This is schematized in the numerical summaries: Acts 2:41 (3000 after Peter's Pentecost speech); 4:4 (raised to 5000, just counting men, after the speech in Solomon's Portico); 5:14 (a multitude of believers added); 6:1 (where the "Hellenists" in question seem best understood as "Greek-living" or "Greek-speaking" Jews [see C. F. D. Moule, *Expository Times* 70 (1958-59):100ff and J. Fitzmyer, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, pp. 237f]); 6:7 (". . . and the number of the disciples multiplied greatly in Jerusalem, and a great many of the priests were obedient to the faith"); 9:31 (the building up of the church throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria--presumably among Jews, since the breakthrough to the Gentiles, via Peter's mission to Cornelius, is yet to come); 14:1 (At Iconium: "A great number of Jews and Greeks"); 21:20 ("how many thousands [*posoi myriades*] there are among the Jews of those who have believed"). Regarding Paul's turning from Jews to Gentiles--at Pisidian Antioch (13:46ff), Corinth (18:6), and Rome (26:28)--it should be observed (1) that Paul's experience of resistance from Jews is subsequent to the initial harvest of Jewish conversions in Jerusalem, and (2) even at Pisidian Antioch and Rome, the resistance among the Jews is not universal (see 13:34 and 28:24). However much the statistical accuracy of Luke's number might be challenged, the point is that he means to show that the history of the church begins with massive conversions among the Jews.

us see whether this notion is in any way coherent with Acts 3:20f, with its talk of the sending of the Christ, whom the heavens must retain until the restoration of all.

A second coming is surely part of Luke's scheme. The men of Galilee are informed by the bright-robed pair at 1:11 that Jesus would eventually return. It is in that sense that the Christ, Jesus, is to be retained in heaven until the times of the restoration of all, i.e., the second advent will occur when that restoration, now begun, is complete. At the same time, there is also a sense in which the Christ, retained in heaven, can in the meantime still be sent. For Luke's account holds in tension two facts about the presence of the risen Lord: (1) he has been withdrawn (Lk 24:51; Acts 1:11,22) and (2) he is identified with the mission church (Acts 9:5; 22:8; 26:15--"I am Jesus whom you are persecuting"), so that the church's mission can be spoken of as the risen Christ himself proclaiming light to the people and the nations (26:23). Given that understanding of Christ's presence and power, it is possible for Luke to speak of the absent one still being sent. This meaning for aposteilēͅ (3:20) will, it is hoped, be confirmed by the balance of the speech.

V. 3:22f: Coming as it does after 3:21, this citation of Dt 18:15ff would seem to be an example of one of the things which God spoke through the prophets. In some way, then, the fulfilment of this prophecy in Jesus is to be understood as an aspect of end-time restoration. We must see if the rest of the speech spells this out.

anastēsō: on the face of it, this word, as applied to Jesus might seem to refer to the initiation of Jesus' earthly prophetic ministry--i.e., "raise up," understood in the usual sense of referring to prophetic vocation. Verse 26 will give a different turn to the word. Here it will suffice to repeat an observation of J. Dupont. In discussing Luke's use of the LXX, D notes that the quotation of Dt 18:15ff at Acts 3:22 and 7:37 corresponds to the LXX rather than the MT but changes the word order. Rather than appealing to a special source, D. suggests that we should take the change in word order as Luke's effort to place a new value on the verb anastēsei, now related to the resurrection of Jesus.[1] The final verse of the speech will bear this out.

---

[1] J. Dupont, "Les Discours . . .," p. 353, n. 67.

XUM

estai de pasa psychē hētis ean mē akousē$_i$ tou prophētou ekeinou exolethreuthēsetai ek tou laou: This sanction backing up the authority of the Prophet-like-Moses is a deft combination of Dt 18:19 LXX (*kai ho anthrōpos, hos ean mē akousē$_i$ hosa ean lalēsē$_i$ ho prophētēs ekeinos epi tō$_i$ onomati mou, egō ekdikēsō ex autou*) and Lv 23:29 LXX (*pasa psychē, hētis mē tapeinōthēsetai en autē$_i$ tē$_i$ hēmera$_i$ tautē$_i$, exolethreuthēsetai ek tou laou autēs*). Thereby the challenge of the encounter with the Prophet-like-Moses is invested with the context of the Day of Atonement, with its sharp alternatives of forgiveness or damnation, restoration or total alientation. (The incident of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5 will demonstrate that dire sanction operating through the authority of Peter.)

V. 24: *pantes . . . katēngeilan tas hēmeras tautas*. Peter's words here (a statement of pesher hermeneutic, i.e., all of scripture is about these current events) reflect the assertion of the Pentecost speech: "This is what the prophet Joel spoke about: *kai estai en tais eschatais hēmerais, legei ho theos, excheō apo tou pneumatos mou epi pasan sarka . . .* receiving the promised Holy Spirit from the Father, he has poured out what you see and hear" (2:16f,33).[1]

---

[1] The use of Ps 2 in Acts 4:25-28 will be the most elaborate use of *pesher* interpretation.

XUM

Analogously, the healing of the temple cripple is a sign that the scriptures about the promised restoration (*apokatastasis*) have begun to be fulfilled, though the restoration of *all* must await the *end* of these days.

V. 25f: Here the Christian conversion-initiation experience is interpreted as the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, most explicitly as it is expressed at Gn 22:18 LXX.[1] We have here the ultimate "spiritualization" of that promise--the end of a development which begins in volume one, the Third Gospel. The *Magnificat* interprets a whole range of material blessings--the scattering of the proud, the filling of the hungry, etc.--as the blessing promised to Abraham and his seed. The *Benedictus* develops this a bit more: the physical rescue from the hands of enemies, seen as the fulfilment of the holy covenant sworn to Abraham, has as its purpose worshippping God (*latreuein autōi*) "all the days of our life." This is further spiritualized when it is said that the "knowledge of salvation" which John is to give turns out to be *aphesis hamartiōn* (1:77). Here in the speech of Acts 3, the nature of the fulfilment of that Abrahamic covenant is given final explicitness--it is interpreted as the conversion of

---

[1] N. Dahl has observed that the alteration of the LXX's *ethnē* to *patriai* may have been done to include the Jews. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in L. Keck and L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 139-158.

XUM

all (which may be a way of saying that that is how the material blessings are going to come about).

V. 26: "God, having raised up his servant, ent him to you first, to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness."

hymin prōton anastēsas: To what does *anastēsas* refer? To the prophetic vocation of Jesus in his earthly ministry? or to his resurrection? Haenchen, noting the ambiguity, opts for the meaning "the sending of Jesus to the earth."[1] Others[2] have taken the word as referring simply to the resurrection. But, in this case, to choose univocally for one meaning or the other may well be an unnecessary resolution of a calculated ambiguity. The text gives evidence that a *double entendre* may well be intended here.

The broader context of the speech suggests first the meaning of the resurrection: the burden of the first four verses of the speech was to proclaim that God has glorified his son/servant by providing this

---

[1] *Acts*, pp. 209f. For others who read the verse this way, see Wendt, R. Smith, Moulton, Zehnle, and Wilckens--all *in loc.* See too Kränkl, *Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesu in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, Biblische Untersuchungen, 8 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1972), p. 201.

[2] E.g., Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1961), p. 62, and an earlier Dupont in *Studies*, p. 141, n. 19.

XUM

healing as a sign of the resurrection (3:12-15).[1] And at 4:1f it is said that Peter and John were accosted because they were proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead. What Dibelius observes about Luke's characteristic way of ending speeches (namely, that they "break off" when the most important point has just been made) is important here. The timing of the interruption suggests that Luke intends v. 26 to be understood about the resurrection.[2]

At the same time it is also true that the citation of Dt 18:15 at v. 22 (with its use of anistēmi with reference to prophetic vocation) provides the immediate context for v. 26 (thus Haenchen is indeed correct in saying that the anastēsas of v. 26 is echoing that of v.22). But is it not possible that anastēsas refers both to vocation and resurrection, interpreting the resurrection of Jesus as his final prophetic vocation? The resurrection, then, is the definitive "raising up" of the prophet Jesus.[1]

---

[1] It should be noted that for Luke egeirō and anistēmi are interchangeable. See Lk 11:8, where both words are used to mean getting out of bed. Similarly, both words are used to refer to the resurrection (see, for example, Acts 3:15 and 13:33).

[2] Wilckens, in Die Missionsreden, p. 60f, sees an inconsistency between the content of Peter's speech in Solomon's Portico and its characterization in 4:2 as "preaching in Jesus the resurrection of the dead." The resurrection, he claims, was only mentioned briefly in 3:15b, and the characterization of 4:2 stems from Luke's interest in highlighting a motif he habitually (see Lk 20:27ff; Acts 23:6f) associates with the Sadducees--their resistence to the Christian teaching on resurrection. Wilckens is surely right about the motif, but wrong in claiming 4:2 as an inaccurate description of the previous speech. For if our interpretation of 3:26 is correct, the speech is profoundly focused on the resurrection: it interprets the healing as a sign that God has raised Jesus (whence the power of his name) who in his resurrection has been definitively "raised up" as prophet.

---

[1] In "The Kerygma of Luke," Interpretation 22 (1968):131-46, Otto Betz argues for a similar interpretation of the resurrection in the light of 2 Sam 7. "With the resurrection of Jesus, God has fulfilled his promise to 'raise up' the offspring of David and to make him the final king, the Christ and Son of God (see Rom 1:3f)" (p. 139). Betz goes on to speak of Luke's presentation of the "twofold resurrection" (resurrection from the dead and exaltation/enthronement) (p. 140). Although he does not develop it here (or in Was Wissen wir von Jesus?), this double entendre on "raise" paves the way for the other play on the word: just as the resurrection from the dead can be interpreted as the "raising up"of the Son of David (fulfilling 2 Sam 7:12--and Lk 1:32), so too that resurrection can be interpreted as the definitive "raising up" of the prophet-like-Moses (fulfilling Dt 18:16ff). Acts 2 focuses on the former (Son of David), Acts 3 on the latter (prophet sent and still active in his mission).

H. Flender points to double meanings at several places in Luke-Acts--Acts 4:22, for example, where "words of grace" seems to mean "graceful speech" (the superficial level at which the congregation receive him) and "words of blessing" (in the sense that they present salvation to those who will receive them). Acts 17:18 presents a misunderstanding in which Paul intends "resurrection" but the people take it to be the name of a god, Anastasis. And at Acts 17:31, pistin paraschōn pasin means most immediately "furnishing a proof" but it also can be taken to mean "offering faith"--for "by calling attention to the proof of the resurrection, a simultaneous offer is made of faith in the risen one." H. Flender, St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History, trans. by R. H. and Ilsa Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 161.

In a popular commentary, Ronald Knox quite simply and with no show of erudition comes to the same

XUM

ton paida autou: Like anastēsas, the word pais is also colored by the context of vv. 22-24. For pais is often used in the LXX to denote the prophet as servant. Indeed, Moses himself was pais par excellence (see Jos 14:7--Mōysēs ho pais tou theou). It may well be that the allusion to the Servant of the Lord (Is 52:13) at Acts 3:13 refers to that OT text more as a description of the Prophet-like-Moses than as type of the suffering servant.[1]

apesteilen auton: this verb has been interpreted usually to refer to the earthly ministry of Jesus. But this is out of harmony with the argument of the speech. Peter's address is, after all, not a reprimand for opposing the prophet Jesus during his earthly ministry; it is rather (from v. 17 on) a call to conversion now,

---

conclusion as ours: "In verse 26, some commentators understand that God 'raised' up his Son merely in the sense of causing him to appear; cf. v. 22. But St. Peter is evidently making a play upon words; God has fulfilled his promise to 'raise up' a Prophet by 'raising up' his Son." The Acts of the Apostles (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954), p. 11.

[1] J. Dupont ("Les discours de Pierre . . . ," p. 344) reads 3:22-24 to say that Jesus is manifest as Prophet-like-Moses by virtue of his resurrection. F. Mussner ("Die Idee der Apokatastasis . . . ," p. 303) sees pais used in v. 26 to refer to Jesus as Moses redivivus (he points for example to Jos 14:7--Mōses ho pais tou theou). Rese, too (Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas [Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitat, 1965], p. 196), urges the pais in v. 26 be understood in connection with the Christos of v. 20 and the Prophet-like-Moses.

in this postresurrection time. It is as the risen Lord that Jesus has now been sent.[1] And there is evidence elsewhere in Acts that Luke can picture the risen Jesus as still operating prophetically in the church's mission.

Acts 26:23, for example, presents the risen Lord as preacher: *ei pathētos ho Christos, ei prōtos ex anastaseōs nekrōn phōs mellei katangellein tō$_i$ te laō$_i$ kai tois ethnesin*. That this is an alternative way of speaking of the church's mission is confirmed by the application of that servant song motif to Paul's mission at 26:18--"You are to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light."

Again, Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch provides similar examples. Having asserted at 13:23 that God has given Jesus as savior to Israel, he makes it clear at verse 33 that it was in the resurrection that this occurred.[2] See 5:31 for the same connection.

At 13:38, Paul announces the preaching of forgiveness of sins as coming presently (in the church's post-Easter mission) through Jesus: *gnostōn oun estō*

---

[1] R. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse*, p. 78, alludes to this interpretation of Acts 3:22-26, but does not relate it to Acts 26:23.

[2] Strikingly, the following verse (13:34) quotes Is 55:3 LXX, a prophetic text whose context embraces mission (*Idou martyrion en ethnesin dedōka auton*, Is 55:4 LXX) and forgiveness (*hoti poly aphēsai tas hamartias hymōn*, Is 55:7 LXX).

XUM

hymin, andres adelphoi, hoti dia toutou hymin aphesis hamartiōn katangelletai. And at 13:47, the servant song imagery applied to Jesus in 26:23 is applied to the church's mission, here as embodied in the mission of Paul and Barnabas.

Further, Acts 5:31 shows that the opportunity for metanoia is given to Israel in this time, after the exaltation of Jesus, now archēgos and sōtēr.

In a remarkable way, then, Acts 3:26 pulls together the whole speech by using language that is in contact with all of its parts. The anastēsas catches up the anastēsei of v. 22 and interprets Jesus' resurrection as the fulfilment of the promise of a Prophet-like-Moses. This, in turn, allows the paida of v. 26 to nuance the paida of v. 13 so that it now takes on the Mosaic connotation. The participle eulogounta echoes the Gn 22:18 quote of the previous verse and interprets the mission proclamation of forgiveness as a fulfilment of the promise to Abraham. And the apesteilen picks up the aposteilēͅ of v. 20 and shows how it is that the one "whom heaven must retain" has nevertheless (as risen Lord) been sent (to the Jews first) and can be further sent (to the Gentiles).

But what is the relationship between 3:20 and the eschatological statements of Acts 1:6-11? The "times of refreshment" and the sending of the appointed Christ

XUM

would appear to be an expansion of 1:8--the promise of the Spirit and the mandate to witness. The suggested background of Lane for kairoi anapsyxeōs relates that phrase to the gift of the Spirit; here the meaning is that those converted receive that gift, as in 2:38. How the sending of the appointed Christ relates to the mission requires further clarification.

First it should be recalled that when persons are 'sent' in Luke-Acts, it is always for a mission. See Lk 1:19,26 (Gabriel); 4:18,43 (Jesus); 9:48 (Jesus); 13:34 (prophets); Acts 7:34,35 (Moses); 22:21; 26:17; 28:28 (Paul's mission). For Acts 3:20,26, the most instructive parallel is Acts 7:35--"This Moses whom they refused . . . God sent as both ruler and deliverer." Inasmuch as Luke uses Moses typologically to speak of Jesus, it is significant that he stresses that Moses was sent after he was rejected by his people to be their deliverer. This is just the point Peter makes regarding Jesus: to those who have rejected him, the risen Jesus is being sent to bless them in the church's mission. This interpretation also makes sense out of prokecheirismenon, for in the other two instances of procheirizomai in Acts (22:14; 26:16) it refers to appointment for mission. The parousia is nowhere in the NT tradition referred to under the image of prophetic mission. Such an image is, however, applied to the risen Lord at 26:23 (phōs . . . ethnesin, Is 42:6; 49:6).

Thus, 3:19-20 has the sense: repent so that the Father's plan of mission may continue to unfold and the Christ appointed to be sent to you first (3:26) may be sent further, until all are restored.

This interpretation fits well with the three-part scheme of scriptural fulfilment expressed at Lk 24:44ff:

1. the Christ should suffer
2. the Christ should rise
3. repentance and forgiveness should be preached to all the nations in his name.

See, too, the same threefold schema of scripture fulfilment at Acts 26:23 (death, resurrection, mission) where it is said that Jesus himself preaches that mission to both Jew and Gentile. The speech of Peter in Solomon's Portico elaborates that same schema: the death and resurrection are treated in 3:12-18; the mission of the Christ in vv. 19-26.

How then are the times of refreshment related to the sending of the Christ in v. 20? They are moments in the unfolding of the mission: as Israel is restored through conversion to Christ (and the growth is pictured as massive, from 3000 to 5000 on the occasion of this speech, multitudes at 5:14, and by 21:20, many thousands in Jerusalem alone), they experience "times of

XUM

refreshment" through the gift of the Spirit, and the second phase of the mission--light to the Gentiles--can get under way. The Messiah appointed for them will be sent on this further mission.

Luke is at home with the paradox of a Christ who is at once kept in heaven (Acts 1:11; 3:21) and sent on mission (3:20,26; 26:23). He dares to express that paradox directly in 3:20f.

Our search for the meaning of _apokatastasis_ has put us in touch with prophetic visions of the restoration of the people. We see that portrayed as beginning in Acts; and the risen Jesus is somehow active (sent) on the mission, although he will not come as he was seen to go until that restoration is complete.

D. Peter and John before the Council
Acts 4:1-22

V. 1 -- Lalountōn: although only Peter has been presented as speaking, the plural is used here, apparently to enlist John's authoritative support. Note the similarity to John's presence in the healing pericope. (See 5:29, where a four-verse speech is attributed to _Petros kai hoi apostoloi_.)

stratēgos tou hierou: another clue to the meaning of _hieros_ in Luke-Acts as embracing the whole temple precincts? Haenchen calls him the _ish har habeth,_ who was in charge of the outer forecourt.[1]

Saddoukaioi: mentioned only once in the Third Gospel (at Lk 20:27), where it parallels the sole use in Mark (12)18, the question about the resurrection). Here the Sadducees are introduced in Acts for the first time.[2]

V. 2: The fact that the opposition comes on the basis of preaching the resurrection strengthens the probability that the anastēsas of 3:26 is to be understood as referring to resurrection.[3]

V. 3--epebalon autois tas cheiras: the use of these words suggests that the prediction of Lk 21:22 is here seen to be fulfilled. Compare, too, Acts 4:14, ouden eichon anteipein with Lk 21:15, ou dynēsontai . . . anteipein.

---

[1] Haenchen, Acts, p. 214, n. 2.

[2] They will be referred to four more times--5:17, where all who were with the high priest were called hē ousa hairesis tōn Saddoukaiōn, and 23:6,7,8, where Paul splits the Council by asserting that he is a Pharisee on trial for his hope in the resurrection of the dead. In four out of the five occasions where Luke-Acts mentions Sadducees, therefore, they function chiefly as opponents of the teaching on resurrection. [Haenchen--Acts, in loc.--observes "In the present verse they (the Sadducees) play the role of an authority, but this in fact they were not."]

[3] And it looks as if Luke has dragged them in to make the point. Haenchen notes, "This is of crucial importance in the historical picture painted by Luke:

V. 4--chiliades pente: this (hyperbolic?) statistic stands with respect to this speech much as the *psychai hōsei trischiliai* of 2:41 relates to the Pentecost speech. It suggests that we have here a similar scheme: event/interpretation/response.

V. 5--*Egeneto . . . synachthēnai autōn tous archontas . . .*: Cerfaux[1] suggests that Ps 2 (see Acts 4:25f) has influenced the choice of vocabulary here. Given the elaborate use of that vocabulary at 4:27f, it is highly probable that Luke's choice of diction here is intended to set the reader up for those later verses.

Vv. 7f: The parallelism of the two questions "by what power" and "in what name" implies that *onoma* here means power-giving authority. The word *dynamis* is informed by the larger context of Luke-Acts. Throughout, *dynamis* has been associated with the Spirit (Lk 1:35, 4:14; 24:49; see, too, Acts 10:38) and healing (Lk 4:36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46). The Pentecost event is understood as the receiving of *dynamis* (Lk 24:49; Acts 1:8). Peter has in Acts 3:12 already denied that the

---

opposition to Christianity is voiced only by one group (*hairesis tōn Saddoukaiōn*, 15:17) among the Jewish people, but not by the strictest rigorists, the Pharisees (*akribestatē hairesis*, 26:5)."

[1] "La premiere communauté chretienne à Jerusalem," *ETL* 16 (1939):15.

XUM

man was healed through their own dynamis; and now, when the question is raised by the Sanhedrin, Luke alludes ironically to the answer before Peter speaks it: "Peter, full of the Holy Spirit . . . ." What all of this does is to point to the person of Jesus as the source of Spirit power (for the reader, not the Sanhedrin). As Haenchen notes,[1] this accords with the promise of Lk 12:11f, this in-filling of Peter with the Holy Spirit. It is also, it should be added, a fulfilment of Lk 21:15.

V. 9--ei hēmeis sēmeron[2] anakrinometha epi euergesia$_i$: if we are on the lookout for the special diction Luke uses to refer to the healing, euergesia[3] will be worth scrutiny. Both its secular and its septuagintal uses are instructive. A. D. Nock's review[4] of the secular use of sōtēr and euergetēs provides ample evidence that Luke in Acts 4:9-12 (see also Acts 10:38) is playing upon language commonly used of Hellenistic benefactors. Augustus and others were commonly hailed as *sōtēr* and *euergetēs*. The fact that these titles are a stereotyped pair may underlie Luke's use of *euergesia*, *sōzein*, and *sōteria* in a single context (Acts 4:9-12). *Ho theos* is here proclaimed as benefactor par excellence.

---

[1] Acts, in loc.

[2] In the Third Gospel, "today" is almost always associated with the theme of salvation (Lk 2:11; 4:21; 19:9; 23:43) or healing (Lk 5:26; 13:32). Here, in Acts 4:9-12, both healing and salvation are associated with sēmeron. See n. 2 on p. 225 for the eschatological implications.

[3] Used 2x in the NT here and 1 Tim 6:2. Two cognates occur in Luke-Acts--euergeteō at Acts 10:38 (summarizing Jesus' ministry) and euergetēs at Lk 22:25.

[4] "Soter and Euergetes," in S. H. Johnson, ed., The Joy of Study (F. C. Grant Festschrift, 1951), pp. 127-48.

Of the six LXX uses of *euergesia*, two are particularly suggestive: Ps 77:11 (*epelathonto tōn euergesiōn autou* (with reference to the exodus wonders!) and Wisdom 16:10ff (where the word of the Lord is called a healing agent in an exodus situation).[1]

sesō$_i$stai: Haenchen rightly observes that the double sense of *sōthēnai* enables Luke to use the healing as a proof that Jesus also brings deliverance in the eschatological sense.

---

[1] The whole context, beginning at 16:1, is illuminating, but we quote here beginning with 16:10ff:

> But not even the venomous teeth of dragons overcame thy sons; for thy mercy was with them and healed them [*iasato*]. For they were pricked, that they should remember thy words; and they were quickly saved [*diesō$_i$zonto*] that not falling into deep forgetfulness, they might be continually mindful of thy *euergesias*. For it was neither herb nor mollifying plaster, that *etherapeusen autous, all' ho sos, kyrie, logos ho pantas iōmenos. Sy gar zōēs kai thanatou exousian echeis, kai katageis eis pylas ha$_i$dou kai anageis . . . Tēn de sēn cheira phygein adynaton estin*.

The context--serpent bites in the desert--would seem to be a version of the Numbers 21 account. The allusion in John 3:14 suggests that this passage was important for Christian reflection.

V. 10: With the formal gnōston estō,[1] Peter reiterates the gist of Acts 3:13-16. If there was any doubt in the previous speech, it is clear here that Luke intends the healing to be understood in the light of the resurrection.

V. 11: "This is the stone which was rejected by you builders, but which has become the head of the corner." Regarding this allusion[2] to Ps 117:22 LXX, at least three things should be noted: (1) it is a proclamation of the resurrection; (2) it resonates with the NT theme of community as true temple; and (3) it is a direct challenge to the authorities.

1. Regarding the resurrection, the text is a perfect vehicle for the Lucan theme of the one denied becoming Lord of all.
2. Regarding the apostles' relationship to the temple, the allusion to the Psalm appears to operate in two ways: (a) it compares their authority in the temple to that of Jesus, and (b) it alludes to the community as temple.

---

[1] See also Acts 2:14; 13:38 (Paul to the synagogue community of Pisidian Antioch) and 28:28 (Paul to the Jews in Rome).

[2] Cerfaux ("Citation scripturaires et tradition textuelle," Receuil L. Cerfaux, II, p. 95f) notes that this reference to Ps 117:22 LXX is only by way of allusion; the only words reproduced are eis kephalēn gōnias. The passage is quoted literally after the LXX in Mk 12:10, Lk 20:17, and Mt 21:42. The hypothesis that Acts is a witness to the Hebrew version different from the LXX is superfluous.

a. In his gospel, Luke, along with the rest of the synoptists, associates Ps 117:22 LXX with Jesus' authority in (over?) the temple (Lk 20:17 and par). In Mark it is tied in closely with the cleansing of the temple; in Luke the encounter with the scribes and elders happens on one of the days he was teaching in the temple, but the issue is still Jesus' authority in the temple.[1] Lk 20 and Acts 4, then, have much in common. In both situations the temple officials question the authority of the protagonist(2)--Jesus or the apostles--to act and teach in the temple; in both situations the protagonists cast the issue in terms of obedience to God or to man (cf. Lk 20:4ff with Acts 4:19); in both cases reference is made to the rejection of Jesus (Lk 20:14f and Acts 4:10); and in both cases Ps 117:22 LXX is invoked (Lk 20:17 and Acts 4:11).

b. We know from a variety of the strands of early tradition that the early Christian community

---

[1] B. Gärtner notes: "The fact that these pericopae [i.e., the temple cleansing, the parable, Ps 117:22 LXX quote] were collected into one account based on the question of the temple and the messiah seems to witness to a conscious theological attitude in the first gospel tradition, before it became fixed by the evangelists." B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), p. 106.

(like the Qumran community, as 4QFlor, for example, indicates)[1] thought of themselves as a spiritual eschatological temple (1 Pt 2:3ff provides a ready example), with Jesus sometimes thought of as the foundation stone, sometimes as a capstone. Since the reference to Ps 117:22 here is used in function of a statement about the authority of the apostolic community, it would appear that the notion of community as temple is somehow in the background.[2] That Jesus

---

[1] J. Daniélou "L'église des Apôtres, p. 67) observes the connection: "1 Pt 2:3ff contains a *florilegium* of OT *testimonia*. Stone sayings are applied to Christ. Ps 117:22 is alluded to in v. 4 and the stone is interpreted as that on which the living temple of the church has been built. Is 28:16, which is used as a *pésher* to supplement this interpretation, was one of the texts used by the Qumran people to apply to themselves as messianic community." [Trans. mine.]

As Gärtner notes in his discussion of the use of temple texts as a symbol for self-identity by the Qumran community, the use of Amos in Acts 15 parallels the way the Qumran covenanters used that text in 4QFlor and C.D. 7:14ff. They saw themselves as the "fallen tent of David restored." *The Temple and the Community*, pp. 40ff.

A. Isaksson understands Mt 19:39 and 1 Cor 11:3-6 against the background of Ez 44:20-22, a description of the life-style of the priest of the new temple. He sees Paul's headshaving at Cenchreae (Acts 18:18) as based on the following premise: ". . . since the new Temple had been established, the Nazirite order was no longer bound up with the old Temple in Jerusalem. The Nazirite vow could not only be made abroad but could also be terminated abroad, for the new Temple was there also." A Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple* (Lund: Cleerup, 1965), p. 196.

[2] Lloyd Gaston, in *No Stone on Another* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), pp. 216f, pointing out that Ps 118 contains no specific reference to the temple and also

XUM

is capstone rather than corner- (or foundation-) stone seems the best interpretation. It fits Luke's theology: just as the church is not so much New Israel as the authentic development of Israel,[1] so Jesus in Luke-Acts does not so much threaten or supplant the temple as provide its completion. Hence the appropriateness of capstone as metaphor.

3. The reference to the Jerusalem authorities as hymōn tōn oikodomōn may be part of the play on benefactor language mentioned in connection with the preceding verse. The temple authorities may set themselves up as builders of the community, but in fact it is ho theos who is the real benefactor-builder; in raising Jesus, he has set the capstone of the eschatological temple not made by hands.[2]

---

that it was used chiefly to show how Jesus' rejection fulfilled Scripture, asserts that "passages based on Ps 118:22 deal only with Jesus' rejection and resurrection and should be excluded from our consideration of the temple image in the New Testament." But, however much this observation may be true of the verse's context in the Psalm, it is its meaning within the context of Luke-Acts that we are pursuing. And both places (Lk 20:17 and Acts 4;11) are situations where the temple is very much a part of the picture.

[1] See Jervell, Luke and the People of God, passim.

[2] Other points of contact between Ps 117 and this section of Acts:

- the alternatives between trusting (or hoping in, or hearing) God or man (cf. Ps 117:8f LXX with Acts 4:19);

V. 12: "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved." Haenchen, echoing Dibelius, notes that we have here a Christian use of a Jewish formula concerned with the *shem adonai* (as in Hermas *Vis*. III 3.5 and IV 2.4), which seems a valid observation and reinforces the probability that expressions such as those in Ps 117 LXX:11f may lie in the background.

dei sōthēnai: The *dei* of the Father's plan signals that *sōthēnai*, which was just used a few verses back to denote physical healing, here refers to eschatological salvation. The one--the physical healing--is the sign of the other.

V. 13: Just as the healing was a source of wonder to the people (3:12--*ti thaumazete epi toutō$_i$;*), now Peter's *parrēsia* is a similar cause of wonder to the authorities. In both cases--the healing and the boldness--we have amazement and recognition (*epeginōskon*,

---

- vindication *tō$_i$ onomati kyriou* (cf. Ps 117:10,11, 12 LXX with Acts 4:11,12, where language conventionally applied to *ho Kyrios* is now predicated of Jesus;
- the Lord proclaimed as sōtēria (cf. Ps 117:14, 15,21,28 with Acts 4:12;
- the situation of being spared to recount the works of the Lord (Ps 117:17 LXX) is very much that of the apostles (see Acts 4:20ff,31.

3:10; 4:13) of transformed individuals who were well known in their previous condition. Word is coupled with work as a sign that these men are God's agents.

kai Iōannou: here (as in 3:4 and, implicitly, in 4:1) John, though mute in the narrative, shares honors in the confrontation.

epeginōskon te autous hoti syn tōi Iēsou ēsan: the import of this recognition is threefold: (1) it emphasizes their *parrēsia*, in that the companions of the recent crucifixion victim dare to confront the authorities; (2) that these men had been with Jesus emphasizes (for the readers' sake) their qualification as witnesses to the whole "way" of Jesus, for they are men of Galilee who had been *with him* from the beginning (see Acts 1:21f; 13:31); and (3) in sustaining recognition as one who had been with Jesus, Peter is reversing his behavior in the courtyard on the night of the arrest (Lk 22:56-60) (though not explicitly present in the text, this element is implicit in the context of the two-volume narrative).

V. 14: *ton te anthrōpon blepontes syn autois hestōta ton tetherapeumenon*: the healed man stands there as a "witness,"[1] part of the chain of witness:

---

[1] Though not, of course, in Luke's technical sense of witness, but in the forensic situation of the narrative.

Peter and John were with Jesus; the healed man is with them. His physical presence (his standing there says it all) confirms the truth of what they have announced about Jesus.

ouden eichon anteipein: a fulfilment of Lk 21:15.[1]

V. 16: gnōston sēmeion gegonen di'autōn: this phrase captures precisely a number of elements:

- the public nature of the healing (gnōston);
- that it is a "sign," a word which has important connotations because of its use in the larger context of Luke-Acts.[2]
- The precise relationship between the apostles and the sign (gegonen di'autōn): they did not do or perform the sign; it happened through their mediation; the point of Peter's opening remark in Solomon's Portico is reinforced: the sign happened through them but God did the healing.

V. 18: mē phthengesthai mēde didaskein: although phthengomai is used only here in Luke-Acts, a kindred word, apophthengomai, is used to describe the

---

[1] As Haenchen notes, in loc.

[2] This will be discussed in chapter five. For the moment, it will be sufficient to note Acts 2:19 (where sēmeia is introduced into the Joel quote); 7:36 (Moses' signs); 2:43; 5:12; 6:8; 8:6,13; 14:3; 15:12.

Pentecostal preaching of the apostles at 2:4, the preaching of Peter at 2:14, and Paul's speech before Agrippa (Acts 26:25). The speech of Solomon's Portico is referred to as *didaskein kai katangellein* in 4:2. The phrase of 4:18, therefore, appears to be a conscious (editorial) reference to all of Peter's public speaking.

epi tō$_i$ onomati: this phrase may well be used here because of its connection with the Prophet-like-Moses passage of Dt 18:19.[1]

---

[1] Although a labored distinction between *en tō$_i$ onomati*, *epi tō$_i$ onomati*, and *eis to onoma* has not proved very useful in the interpretation of Luke-Acts, there is a connection between Luke's use of *epi tō$_i$ onomati* and the LXX which is very suggestive. In Luke-Acts, all the instances of *epi tō$_i$ onomati* have to do with mission: Lk 21:8 refers to the pseudo-Christs who will come in Jesus' name; Lk 24:47 refers to the fulfilment of scripture in the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins in the name of the Christ; and the four remaining uses occur in the statements by or about the Sanhedrin's order that the apostles not teach or speak in the name (*epi tō$_i$ onomati*) of Jesus (Acts 4:17,18; 5:28,40). It is possible, then, that Luke uses *epi tō$_i$ onomati* when he wants to stress the mission as commissioned by Jesus. The selective use of this phrase alone suggests this. But a look at the LXX provides a cogent reason for using the phrase. It is the phrase which is used in the LXX of what is (for Luke) perhaps the most important passage for seeing the prophetic missions of Jesus and the church as the fulfilment of scripture: Dt 18:19 reads, "And whatsoever words that prophet shall speak in my name (*epi tō$_i$ onomati*), I will take vengeance on him." And the same rare (in the LXX) idiom is used in another important passage: at Ex 5:22ff (". . . why have you sent me? For from the time that I went to Pharaoh to speak in your name (*epi tō$_i$ sō$_i$ onomati*) he has afflicted these people." Perhaps, then, Luke uses *epi tō$_i$ onomati* in those places (especially Lk 24:47 and Acts 4:17,18; 5:28,40) because he associates that phrase with the divine commission of Moses (Ex 5:22) and the Prophet-like-Moses (Dt 18:19).

V. 19: The dilemma Peter presents here reflects the dilemma Jesus presented the officials in that similar challenge regarding authority in the temple--Lk 20:4 (*ex ouranou ēn ē ex anthrōpōn*).

V. 20: *ha eidamen kai ēkousamen*: telling what one has seen and heard is paradigmatic to Luke's conception of the church's mission. For example, at Lk 10:24, Luke has Jesus address to the seventy-two the Q saying which Matthew associates with the parable material (interpreting Is 6 in Mt 13): "for I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it." Note that this mode of witnessing is established already at Lk 2:18ff, where it is said that the shepherds amaze the people by what they tell them and then return *ainountes ton theon epi pasin hois ēkousan kai aidon kathōs elalēthē pros autous*. Similarly, at Lk 7:22, Jesus tells the disciples of John to tell him about *ha eidete kai ēkousate*. And Peter, in Acts 2:33, refers to the Pentecostal phenomena as *ho hymeis [kai] blepete kai akouete*.

V. 21b: *hoti pantes edoxazon ton theon epi tōi gegonoti*: what is described as the bystanders' response to the healing of the paralytic in the gospel in a single verse (Lk 5:26--*kai ekstasis elaben hapantas kai edoxazon ton theon*) is spread out in the description of

XUM

the people's response to the healing of the temple cripple (*kai eplesthesan thambous kai ekstaseōs*, 3:10; and *pantes edoxazon ton theon*, 4:21). It is as if the healing story extended from 3:1 to 4:22, with the "response" (people accepting, authorities rejecting) comprising 3:9 to 4:22.

V. 22: *etōn gar ēn pleionōn tessarakonta ho anthrōpos*: The obvious narrative function of this detail is to emphasize the wonderfulness of the cure. Inasmuch as the eighteen years of the bent woman's condition proved to have suggestive associations with Israel's history, we should at least allow for the possibility that the more than forty years of this man's life may have a secondary, symbolic function. The forty years of Israel's wilderness experience come readily to mind.[1]

---

[1] While *tessarakonta* is not of emphatic significance in the synoptic tradition generally--Matthew and Mark use the number forty only with reference to the period of Jesus' temptation--Luke uses the number ten times in his two-volume work (*tesserakonta* 8x and *tesserakontaetēs* 2x). The references to the "more than forty men" (Acts 23:13,21) who plan to ambush Paul would seem to function on the literal level much as the literal meaning of "more than forty years" of Acts 4:22--a considerable group of men and a considerable number of years. But the seven other uses all have to do with significant periods of Israel's history: Acts 7:23 (Moses' age at his first encounter with his countrymen); 7:30 (40 years later, the vocation of Moses); 7:36 (he [Moses] led them *poiēsas terata kai sēmeia . . .* for forty years); 7:42 (Stephen quotes Amos 5:25 against the idolatry committed in the desert

XUM

to sēmeion touto tēs iaseōs: These final words highlight the fact that the healing of 3:1-11 has been the focus of the action, the text of the speeches.

E. The Community Prays for Boldness Acts 4:23-31

V. 23: pros tous idious: not the 3000 or the 5000, nor only the Twelve (Luke would have said the Twelve), but possibly something like the 120 of Acts 1.[1]

V. 25ff: After God is addressed as creator in words echoing Ex 20:11 and Ps 146:6, Psalm 2:1-2 LXX is quoted and given a pesher interpretation in a mode for which we find analogues among the Qumran material. The words of the ancient text are applied to current events. The way it is done here can be schematized in the following way:

---

during the forty years); 13:18 (for forty years he [God] endured them in the desert); 13:21 (God gave them Saul for forty years). And so the most characteristic use of 40 years is the reference to the wilderness period--a time leading to the gift of inheritance (land) and a time of rebellion. Both aspects, it appears, are relevant here. The time preceding the word of Jesus to Israel has been a period of rebellion and the moment of imminent fulfilment.

[1] Although this conjecture may seem to take Luke too literally, it seems good to try to imagine as concretely as possible his narrative presentation of the tradition.

ethnē = the Roman soldiers
hoi basileis = exemplified by Herod
ho Kyrios = *ho theos*
ho Christos = Jesus (*hon echrisas*)[1]
hoi laoi = the "peoples" of Israel
hoi archontes = exemplified by Pilate

Besides the explicitly quoted Ps 2, it has been observed (e.g., by Haenchen) that Hezekiah's prayer in Is 37:16ff may well have provided a model for the prayer of Acts 4. This possibility deserves further examination. The following similarities emerge:

- God is addressed as creator: *Ho poēsas ton ouranon kai tēn gēn* (Acts 4:24; cf. Is 37:16);
- the recital of a threatening situation: Is 37:18f, in its rehearsal of the victories of Sennacherib, is similar to Acts 4:27, the summary of the plot against Jesus (introduced by the identical phrase, *ep'alētheias*);
- the plea for the Lord to regard the threatening words of the enemy: Is 37:17--*ide tous logous . . . Sennachēreim*; Acts 4:29--*epide epi tas apeilas autōn*;
- the request for vindication now: Is 37:20--*nyn*[2] *de Kyrie ho theos hemōn sōson hēmas ek cheiros autou*; Acts 4:29f--*kai ta nyn Kyrie . . . dos . . . lalein ton logon sou en tō*$_i$ *tēn cheira sou ekteinein*.

---

[1] As in Acts 10:38; a reference to Is 61:1, as M. Rese notes in *Alttestamentliche Motive*, p. 181.

[2] Reading here *nyn* with B, which mirrors the MT.

And further contacts may be discerned in the continued context of Is 37:

- the action of enemies interpreted as governed by the plan of God: compare Acts 4:28--*poiēsai hosa hē cheir sou kai hē boulē sou proōrisen genesthai* with Is 37:26, where Isaiah interprets Sennacherib's victories as the work of God;
- the work of the enemies described as being against the "holy one": compare Acts 4:27--*ton hagion paida* with Is 37:23--*ton hagion tou Israēl*.

There is, however, a striking difference which becomes apparent when we compare the prayer of Acts 4 with those of Hezekiah and the "speaker" of Psalm 2; whereas the two OT models speak of a violent physical rescue from enemies (Ps 2 referring to the threatening nations being hurled with a rod of iron and even being dashed to pieces, and Is 37:20 speaking of being saved from Sennacherib's hand, which Is 37:36ff spells out as the destruction of Sennacherib's army), the vindication requested in the Acts prayer is not escape from persecution but the forwarding of the mission through the word and work of *parrēsia* and healing. Just as the originally "materialistic" promises of Abraham become, in the speech of Acts 3, "spiritually" understood as conversion, so here physical victory is superseded by mission: the creator and Lord of history now reveals himself in healing transformation rather than in slaughter.

XUM

There is an abrupt transition between verses 27-28 (referring to the conspiracy against Jesus) and v. 29 (referring to the Sanhedrin's threats against the apostolic community). Haenchen rightly calls this transition a "seam" inasmuch as the autōn of v. 29 would most logically in the context refer to the enemies of Jesus, and yet, in order to fit the meaning of v. 29, it must refer to the Sanhedrin. The transition is indeed abrupt; but, rather than marking poor editorial suturing, the very abruptness of the transition serves to bring home the point all the more strongly--that the situation of the apostolic community parallels that of Jesus; and that, just as God vindicated Jesus via the resurrection (that is what all the speech making has been about, so it needn't be rehearsed again), he will vindicate the apostolic community, whose prophetic mission is identical with the risen Servant Jesus.

Very much as 3:26 summarized the themes of the speech in Solomon's Portico, 4:29ff catches up the whole of 3:1-4:31. Throughout, God has been the source of the healing and preaching, and now the prayer recognizes that fact once again (dos tois doulois sou).[1]

---

[1] Cf. Acts 14:3--"So they remained for a long time, speaking boldly for the Lord, who bore witness to the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands." This would seem to be a paradigmatic statement of the notion of mission in Acts--word and word as God's gift through men's hands.

XUM

Word and work are bound together, and the prayer acknowledges this (*dos . . . lalein ton logon sou en tōi tēn cheira sou ekteinein se eis iasin kai sēmeia kai terata ginesthai*). And all of this is done *dia onomatos* (3:6, 16; 4:7,10,12,17,18,30) *tou hagiou* (3:14; 4:27,30) *paidos* (3:13,26; 4:27,30) *Iēsou*. And it is effected by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Whatever is to be decided regarding the connection between the Qumran community and the early Christians,[1] a document from Cave Four (4Q Florilegium) provides a startling precedent for the use of Psalm 2 to interpret the lot of the community.

A fragment 4QFlor is a chain of *pesher* interpretations. The Qumran commentators interpret the house of 2 Sam 7:10 to be the present community of the last days--themselves. Amos 9:11 (see Acts 15!) is used to interpret 2 Sam 7:11,14 ("'I will raise up your seed after you . . . ' The latter *tent of David* is he who shall arise to save Israel.")[2] Thus, both community and individual savior are identified. The fragmentary manuscript concludes with a pesher on Ps 2:1, which

---

[1] For a careful study of the question, see J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "Jewish Christianity in Acts in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in Keck and Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts*, pp. 233-257.

[2] Translation from G. Vermes, trans. and ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966), p. 246.

XUM

seems to interpret "the Anointed" as "the elect (chire בְחִיהֵי, plural!)[1] of Israel in the last days."[2] It is not impossible that Luke, or the tradition before him, used Ps 2 in the same way.[3]

---

[1] I refer here to the Hebrew text as reproduced in E. Lohse, ed., Die Texte aus Qumran (Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1971), in loc.

[2] A. E. Schweizer also notes in Studies in Luke-Acts, p. 192, n. 19--though he misconstrues 4QFlor v. 17 as referring to the righteous ones rather than the sons of Zadok.

[3] S. S. Smalley's observations on this part of Acts are worth full reproduction:

> The disciples need not be anxious about the time of the kingdom's advent. The fact and presence of the Spirit are sufficient guarantee of its realization already (Acts 1:8, using alla). As a result, the pattern prayer is now Acts 4, the only time in Acts when the words of a prayer are specified. The disciples have now been taught to pray, and Luke gives a paradigmatic example of it. What do they say? The kings of the earth have set themselves in array against the king and servant Jesus (Acts 4:26f). But this is part of God's plan (v. 28), and the king has been triumphantly vindicated (v. 30). The petitionary aspect of the prayer, while not ignoring the future tense of the kingdom's arrival altogether, is accordingly differently slanted. The request is now for boldness in speaking the word of God, which is the word of the kingdom of God (vv. 29, 31; cf. 8:12; 20:25). In answer to this prayer, the Spirit who continues after the resurrection as before it to manifest the kingdom's presence, also enables the disciples to carry out their task of preaching God's word and rule (v. 31)."
> S. S. Smalley, "Spirit, Kingdom, and Prayer in Luke-Acts," Nov Test 15 (1973), p. 70.

XUM

F. Summary

To use terminology developed long after the formation of the NT, it may be said that the larger context of the speeches and prayer of Acts 3:12-4:31 has interpreted the healing as a sign which is eschatological, christological, ecclesiological, and soteriological.

It is an _eschatological_ sign in that is signals the experiences of the Jerusalem Christian community as an important moment in the inaugurated fulfilment of the end-time expectations; the prophetic visions of the end-time restoration have begun to be fulfilled; the healing is a sign among the "signs and wonders" of a new exodus; it is the time of the Prophet-like-Moses who has been "raised up" indeed.

It is a _christological_ sign in that it shows Jesus of Nazareth as glorified by the Father in resurrection. It is precisely as Prophet-like-Moses that Jesus has been raised (in this state he outdoes even the restoring work expected of Elijah). In this role he is _pais_ of God leading his people toward their fullest inheritance, liberation from sin, known by many and proclaimed to all.

It is an _ecclesiological_ sign in that it acts out the apostles' relationship to God in the mission. Their healing and preaching are gifts given by God in the name of Jesus and exercised in the power of the

Spirit. In this work they have inherited the prophetic ministry of Jesus.

It is a soteriological sign in that Peter can use the healed man as a visual aid to demonstrate how God saves: he offers an unexpected gift of restoration, which is received in faith by "calling upon the name of the Lord." If entering the temple was paradigmatic of salvation in the Psalms, now entering the temple is superseded by joining the community, the true temple of which Jesus is the capstone.

The next chapter will explore just how Acts 3 and 4 develop those themes in the larger context of the whole of Luke-Acts.

XUM

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SIGN'S SIGNIFICANCE WITHIN LUKE-ACTS

The foregoing exegesis has suggested that the immediate context of the healing of the temple cripple (Acts 3:12-4:31) interprets that action with reference to God's action in Jesus and the church understood as the fulfilment of Old Testament promises ("eschatology"),[1] with reference to the identity and status of Jesus ("christology"), with reference to the identity and status of the apostolic community ("ecclesiology"),[2] and, finally, with reference to the nature of God's offer of grace ("soteriology"). It remains now to examine these themes in greater depth and to see how the interpretive context of Acts 3 and 4 illuminates (and is illuminated by) the larger context of the entirety of Luke-Acts.

---

[1] Implied in this definition is an interpretation of Luke's view of history which the following discussion intends to demonstrate.

[2] This rubric is used to designate the image of the nature and mission of the Christian community presented in Luke-Acts.

XUM

A. The Healing as Eschatological Sign

When Acts 3-4 is read within the total fifty-two chapters of Luke-Acts, it becomes evident that Luke provides an eschatological understanding of the healing of the temple beggar through several means: (1) by presenting it as a sign among the "signs and wonders" of a new exodus, (2) by showing it to be part of the fulfilment of the promises of God, (3) by means of contact with the Joel quote of Acts 2, (4) by means of his presentation of the Reign of God within the larger framework of the two volumes, and (5) by interpreting the healing as an image of the restoration of Israel.

1. A Sign among "Signs and Wonders"

In the account of Peter, John, and the healed man before the Sanhedrin, Luke refers to the healing twice as a *sēmeion*: in their closed caucus, the members of the council wonder what to do since every one in Jerusalem knows that a *sēmeion* has been worked through the apostles (4:16); and, by way of closing the pericope, Luke notes that all the people were glorifying God because "the man to whom *sēmeion touto tēs iaseōs* had occurred was over forty years old" (4:22). Later, when Luke presents the apostolic community praying for more of the same, they ask that "signs and wonders be performed through the name of thy holy servant Jesus"

XUM

(4:30). This "sign of healing," then, is the sort of thing Luke can refer to in the phrase *sēmeia kai terata*--a phrase he avoids in his gospel but employs nine times in Acts. That he intends *sēmeia kai terata* to be understood in the LXX sense of exodus wonders[1] is evident in his use of the phrase at Acts 7:36. There he has Stephen speak of the *terata kai sēmeia* which Moses worked on the exodus.[2] When Luke quotes Joel in Acts 2, he elaborates the *terata* (already present in the LXX text) with a parallel *sēmeia*. In this way he makes more explicit the exodus theme of Joel and establishes the meaning of *terata kai sēmeia* (or *sēmeia kai terata*)[3] in such a way that any future references to

---

[1] "In Greek-speaking Judaism in so far as this stands behind the literature comprised in the LXX the formula *sēmeia kai terata*, based on the Deuteronomistic model, seems to be reserved for God's wonders in the days of Moses." C. H. Rengstorf, "*sēmeia ktl*.," *TDNT* 7:221.

[2] How Moses is developed as a type of Jesus will be discussed below in section B.

[3] The stereotyped LXX phrase is *sēmeia kai terata*. Therefore it is notable that of the nine instances of this combination in Acts, five times it occurs in the unexpected order *terata kai sēmeia* (2:19,22,43; 6:8; 7:36). Rengstorf ascribes a significance to the difference, asserting that *terata kai sēmeia* is used in typological references and that the other form, *sēmeia kai terata* (4:30; 5:12; 14:3; 15:12) is reserved for "apostolic awareness and experience." (*TDNT* 7:243.) That neat distinction, however, does not hold up. For example, Acts 14:3 (with *sēmeia kai terata*) is clearly modeled on 2:19 (a *terata . . . kai sēmeia* verse), with its phrasing about *God giving* the signs and wonders. The variation *terata kai sēmeia* might better be understood as deriving from the order which Luke (or a

XUM

that combination of words will connote at once (a) the theme of new exodus (already present in the LXX phrase) and (b) the theme of the last days (derived specifically from the new context in the Joel quote). In this way the *sēmeia kai terata* of the apostles and Jesus (Acts 2:22) are interpreted as signs of a new exodus and of the last days foretold by Joel.[1]

As to content, the phrase *sēmeia kai terata* in Acts refers to healings primarily, perhaps exclusively.

---

predecessor) created when *sēmeia* was interpolated in the LXX quote of Joel at Acts 2:19, thereby yielding the pattern *terata . . . kai sēmeia*. It was natural then for the writer to use that order in subsequent allusions. That he is willing to use the unexpected order even at the specifically Mosaic reference at 7:36 suggests that he wants to unify the typological points of view: the fulfilment of Joel's end-time vision and the new exodus are one and the same. If we must reach further for a special meaning in the order *terata kai sēmeia*, we might look to Wis 10:16 LXX. This is the one place in the LXX where the order *terata kai sēmeia* occurs. The passage relates the exodus as the work of Wisdom who "entered the soul of the servant of the Lord [Moses] and withstood dreadful kings *en terasi kai sēmeiois*" and, indeed, "made the tongues of them that cannot speak eloquent [and] . . . prospered their works in the hand of the holy prophet (Wis 10:21-11:1)."

[1] Luke avoids using *sēmeia kai terata* in his gospel. The one place where Mark has the phrase (13:22; par. Mt 24:24), Luke omits it (at 17:23). Why? Perhaps because the phrase as he finds it in the gospel tradition refers to the actions of pseudoprophets and pseudomessiahs, and Luke does not want to prejudice the signs and wonders he intends to celebrate in the narrative of Acts. (See, as well, the sole use of the phrase in the Fourth Gospel [Jn 4:48], where it appears to be used in a negative way.)

XUM

Luke ascribes terata kai sēmeia to the mediation of the apostles at 2:43, in the first major summary regarding community life. Presumably, the healing narrative a few verses later, Acts 3:1-11, provides as example of such activity. In the Community prayer at 4:30, sēmeia kai terata interprets the extension of God's hand eis iasin. And in the summary references to the sēmeia kai terata of the apostles (5:12ff) and to the sēmeia of Philip (8:6ff), the context shows that healing is meant.[1]

By calling it a "sign" among "signs and wonders," then, Luke has interpreted the healing of the man born lame as one of the wonders of new exodus. As we will see in our discussion of Moses typology in section B, "signs and wonders" is simply one element on a larger complex of exodus typology.

2. A Sign of the Last Days Begun

Our analysis of 3:26 showed how Peter's speech interpreted the "current events" of resurrection and mission as the fulfilment of the promises of Dt 18 and Gn 22:18. A glance at the larger framework reveals this view of the moment to be of a piece with the speech of Acts 2.

---

[1] Although the parrēsia of Peter is very much a source of wonder and a demonstration of God's power, the usage of the phrase sēmeia kai terata does not seem

Peter's Pentecost speech emphasized that what the crowds were witnessing in the behavior of the Spirit-filled Galileans (mistakenly interpreted as drunkenness) was the fulfilment of Joel: "This," says Peter, referring to their experience, "is what was spoken by the prophet Joel, _kai estai en tais eschatais hēmerais . . ._" (2:17). The words "in the last days" appear to be Lucan redaction (or at least a redaction he retains if he does not create it), making it quite clear how he means this passage of Joel to be understood: now is the time of signs and wonders and prophecy and the outpouring of the Spirit, before the coming of the great day of the Lord (_prin elthein hēmeran kyriou tēn megalēn [kai epiphanē]_--Acts 2:20c). Similarly, in the speech in Solomon's Portico--in which he interprets another mysterious phenomenon, the healing of the man born lame--he says, "All of the prophets . . . proclaimed these days (3:24)." "All of the prophets" quite probably includes Josel, used so recently to interpret the signs of the times. As the specific event of "these days" which has occasioned the

---

to cover _parrēsia_. Acts 4:29f, for example, suggests that the healing signs are a support to the gift of _parrēsia_, much as the _sēmeia_ of Moses supported the speech of Aaron (see Ex 4:14ff). Note, too, that in the same Exodus context, the Lord speaks of extending his hand (Ex 3:20).

speech, the healing is one of the signs of these last days.

3. "And all who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved."

In our earlier discussion of the phrase "to call upon the name of the Lord" (pages 152 ff), we emphasized the Joel quote (Acts 2:21) as the source and context for its meaning. It will be appropriate here to review that data and to underscore its eschatological implications.

Peter commands the man to walk "in the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene" (3:6); through faith in the name, the name has strengthened the man (3:16); the apostles are asked by what name they have done this (4:7); "in Jesus' name," they answer (4:10); and they add that by no other name can we be saved (4:12). Clearly, we have, in the case of the temple beggar, a calling upon the name of the Lord (now understood as that of Jesus Christ of Nazareth) and the result is a man described as "saved."

The larger context of Acts provides further light. In several places, the phrase "those who call upon the [or "your"] name" is used as a kind of codeword for Christians (Acts 9:14,21), and in the third version of Paul's call and conversion, Ananias instructs

XUM

him to "call upon his [Jesus'] name" (22:16).[1] Further, the Pentecost speech of Peter, at 2:39b, with reference to future converts, alludes to Joel 3:5b (a phrase in the Joel text which occurs just after the cut-off point of the quotation at Acts 2:21), where God is the caller: hosous an proskalesetai kyrios ho theos hēmōn.[2]

It seems, then, that the Christian metanoia is interpreted by the phrase from Joel as the act of persons responding to the end-time presence of God, according to which one either "calls upon the name of the Lord" and is "saved" or, as the context of Joel implies, suffers the punishment brought down upon the enemies of Israel.[3]

---

[1] See also Rom 10:13.

[2] Conzelmann, in Theology of St. Luke, p. 156, n. 1, discussing "call" vocabulary, notes that proskaleisthai occurs in Acts 2,39 in a quotation [from Joel] and is used for being commissioned to a task by God (Acts 16:10) and by the Spirit (13:2). He concludes that "the eschatological meaning of the quotation in 2:39 has been transformed by Luke into the 'call' in the church's sense." Could it not be said, rather, that Luke has invested the church's call with an eschatological sense?

[3] A similar alternative is expressed at 3:23, where the phrase of Lv 23:39 is enlisted to say that those who do not listen to the prophet will be "destroyed from the people."

XUM

If, in Luke-Acts, then, the Joel quote provides the primary context for understanding the significance of calling upon the name of the Lord and being saved, we can expect this insight to nuance our interpretation of Acts 3-4. And it does. The summary about community life which immediately precedes our pericope, appears to use the language of the Joel quote in two places: the reference to the *terata kai sēmeia* done through (*dia*) the apostles (2:43b) and the reference to those whom the Lord added daily to the group as *hoi sōͅzomenoi* (2.47b).[1] It is reasonable, then, to see Acts 3:1-11 as a concrete example of the apostolic *terata kai sēmeia* and of a *sōͅzomenos* being added.[2] The further references to salvation (4:9,12) and the name (3:6,16; 4:7,10,12) would seem, then, to take on an eschatological coloring through association with that Joel quote. All of which is simply to say that the healing is understood as a sign of the last days spoken of by Joel.

---

[1] The present participle suggests that the escape from judgment is occurring in the present, but note that *hoi sōͅzomenoi* is used by Paul in 1 Cor 1:18 in a context which still sees judgment as future (1 Cor 1:8).

[2] See Lk 13:23 and 1 Cor 1:18 and 2 Cor 2:15 for the other NT instances of that participle describing Christians--in the latter two cases, paired with those in the alternative situation, *hoi apollymenoi*.

XUM

4. A Sign of the Reign of God

This is not the place to work out a fresh interpretation of the kingdom of God in Luke-Acts, but it is pertinent to our discussion to observe that our healing pericope is, at least implicitly, a sign of the kingdom of God.[1] A number of factors point in this direction: (a) Lk 4:43 ("I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also") implies that the activity of 4:16ff, mainly healing, is to be understood as "preaching the good news of the kingdom of God"; (b) the missionary charge of 10:9 ("Heal the sick . . . and say to them, 'The kingdom of God has come near to you'") suggests that the healing is a sign of what is preached; (c) Jesus' saying at 11:20 ("If it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you") is a key for the interpretation of his healing ministry; (d) our discussion of Acts 1:6ff as related to Lk 12:32 and 22:29 has, it is hoped, opened the possibility that Luke sees the experience of the apostolic community as the activity of the unfolding Reign of God;[1] (e) the use of basileia tou theou in Acts suggests that that phrase is meant to express far more than the parousia. The use of the phrase with respect to Paul's preaching is especially instructive. It is curious that Luke nowhere uses the phrase 'kingdom of God' within the speeches of Acts and yet he can capsulize Paul's preaching as being about the kingdom of God (see 19:8; 20:25; 28:23,31). It is reasonable to assume that Luke means this phrase to have some relationship

---

[1] The discussion of Lucan eschatology is sometimes given an artificial tidyness by equating Kingdom with Parousia or the End. A recent example is the discussion of Stephen Wilson. He reduces the eschatology of Luke-Acts to the issue of when the Parousia or End is to come. Accordingly, he sorts Lucan texts into those which imply a delay of the End, "the delay strand," (Lk 22:69; 19:11; 9:27; 19:41f; 21:20-4) and those which imply an early arrival of the End, "the imminent expectation strand" (Lk 18:8; 10:9,11: 12:38-40 and 41-48; 12:54-13:9; Lk 21:32. However, when basileia tou theou is freed from equation with Parousia, Wilson's categories of "delay strand" and "imminent expectation strand" lose their usefulness. Rather than showing a preoccupation with the final manifestation of the kingdom, late or soon, Luke appears more interested in portraying the inauguration of the Reign of God in the ministries of Jesus and the church. The Kingdom is present in the work of Jesus (Lk 11:20 and 17:21, texts with which Wilson chooses not to deal in depth); and the life and mission of the church unfolds through the power of the Risen Lord, whose exaltation is portrayed as the enthronement of the Davidic messiah (Acts 2:29-36). And it is this regency which is the most natural contextual referent for the Reign of God preached in Acts (see 19:8; 20:25; 28:23,31).

In this light texts such as Lk 22:69 and Acts 7:56 speak not so much of the End's delay as of the Christ's present reign.

---

[1] See above, pp. 166ff.

XUM

to the content of Paul's preaching as it is presented in Acts. In the one example of Pauline missionary preaching to the Jews (and Luke uses basileia tou theou with respect to preaching to Jews only), Luke shows Paul speaking first about the plan of God in Israel's history (13:16b-22) and then goes on to speak of the culmination of that plan in the events of Jesus (13:23-41). The whole content of that speech could be characterized as "the reign of God"--God's rule as expressed in history and culminating in Jesus Christ. This leads one to believe that in Acts basileia tou theou is meant to refer to the whole of God's action (past, present, and future) and not primarily to its fulfilment in the parousia. In this context, then, the act of God which is the healing of the temple beggar may be understood as a sign of the Reign of God.

5. A Sign of the Restoration of Israel

In our discussion of the chronoi apokatastaseōs (pp. 162ff), we advanced the hypothesis that Luke presents the time of restoration as beginning to unfold and that the healed man is an emblem of Israel restored. That discussion has already drawn upon the larger framework of Luke-Acts to discover how Luke developed the theme of restoration elsewhere.[1] It will perhaps suffice here to emphasize that that theme of restoration is nothing if not eschatological. For example, Amos 9 was used at Acts 15:16 precisely to show that the conversion of many Jews to faith in Jesus is the fulfilment of the expectation of a restored Israel. Similarly, Luke's placement of the parable of the mustard seed (Lk 13:18ff) within the immediate framework surrounding the restoration of the daughter of Abraham (13:10-17) appears to interpret that healing by way of the parable's allusion to Exechiel 17:22f, where a tree is an image of Israel restored. And our leaper of Acts 3:1-11 is an emblem of what is happening in the early chapters of Acts, especially as it reflects Is 35:5, Israel restored and launched on a second exodus.[1]

---

[1] Franz Mussner finds the motif of restoration present in Acts in ways that reach far beyond the explicit use of the noun apokatastastis (3:21 and the verb apokathistaneis (1:6). He sees the same theme implied in the use of Amos 9 in Acts 15:16f (the restored tent of David, confirming our observation on this point), the reference to Is 55:3 at Acts 13:34, and in several of the motifs clustered in the Pentecost narrative--Jesus as messianic son of David (Acts 2:30,36, a restored Israel being implied in the OT references to the restored Davidic kingship; cf 2 Sam 7; Jer 23:5ff; Ez 34:23f): Jesus as Moses *redivivus* (2:22, illuminated by 7:22,36,37 and 3:22,26); the Christian experience of the renewal of prophecy (Acts 2:27, quoting Joel); and the Pentecost experience possibly understood as the end-time Sinai experience. Mussner, "Die Idee," *passim*.

---

[1] The following excerpt from Ginzberg's Legends of the Jews, even if it reflected tradition that is postbiblical, is an important indication of how important Is 35:6 could be in Jewish speculation about the end-time exodus:

> "When the time drew near [for the revelation of the Torah on Sinai], God said to Moses, 'The time is at hand when I shall bring about something entirely new.'
>
> "This new miracle of which God spoke was the healing of all the sick among the Jews. God had wanted to give the Torah to the Jews immediately after the exodus from Egypt, but among them were found many that were lame, halt, or deaf; wherefore God said: 'The Torah is without blemish, hence would I not bestow it on a nation that has in it such as are burdened with defects. Nor do I want to wait until their children shall have grown to manhood, for I do not desire any longer to delay the delight of the Torah.' For these reasons nothing was left Him to do, but to heal those afflicted with disease. In the time between the exodus from Egypt and the revelation on Mount Sinai, all the blind among the Israelites regained their sight, all the halt became whole, so that the Torah might be given to a sound and healthy people. God wrought for that generation the same miracle which I will hereafter bring about in the future world, when 'the eyes of the blind shall be opened, the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, and lame man leap as an hart, and the tongues of the dumb sing.'" Legends, III. 78. See note 176.

The notion of Israel as a cripple who is raised up by the Lord is also remarkably reflected in the later Jewish tradition transmitted in the Pesikta Rabbati 36,2:

> With what may the congregation of Israel in this world be compared? With a cripple who is unable to come or go, so that the nations of

6. Conclusion

We have found that the larger context supports the interpretation of the temple cripple as an eschatological sign--a sign that the end-time promise of the restoration of Israel and of a new exodus[1] has begun to be fulfilled, a sign of the

---

> the earth revile every Israelite, saying to each one of them every day: Thy God, where is He? Why does He not save thee, seeing thou art subjected to our power and that we have the means to slay thee, to destroy thee? The congregation of Israel replies: A day is appointed for me when my king will reveal himself for my sake. He will strengthen me and stand me up on my feet, as is said FOR THE OPPRESSION OF THE POOR, FOR THE SIGHING OF THE NEEDY, NOW WILL I ARISE, SAITH THE LORD (Ps 12:6).

Pesika Rabbati: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths, trans. William G. Braude, Yale Judaica Series, vol. 18 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 681.

While neither of these later rabbinical traditions may stem from the first century C.E., they are at least independent witnesses to the fact that the symbolic interpretation of a cripple as an emblem of Israel is not simply the "reading-in" of a 20th-century mind.

[1] Besides the specifically Mosaic typology discussed below (second B), other components of exodus typology may be discerned in the Third Gospel, e.g., at Lk 10L9 (an allusion to Dt 8:5, referring to the power God gave the Israelites over serpents and scorpions during the wilderness period [see the discussion of Michi Miyoshi, *Der Anfang des Reiseberichts: Lk 9, 51-10,24*, Analecta biblica, 60 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), pp. 103ff]) and at Lk 11:20 (the "finger of God" saying, an allusion to Ex 8:19). In the culminating verses

XUM

salvation that comes to those who do the end-time thing of calling upon the name of the Lord.

It should be apparent that the eschatological perspective which we have found in Acts 3-4 flies in the face of Conzelmann's rigid periodization, which sets off the time of the church in parentheses, as it were, relegating the "today" of Jesus to the past and reserving the Kingdom of God for the parousia.[1] Focusing upon the healing of Acts 3 has helped to confirm the interpretation of scholars such as W. Robinson, H. Flender, and F. Danker, who take Luke as presenting the ministry of Jesus and the church as the inauguration of the end-time.[2] Whereas Conzelmann speaks of a conscious

---

(f:30f) of our section in Acts, the phrase *tēn cheira sou ekteinein se eis iasin kai sēmeia kai terata ginesthai* appears to be an allusion to the Lord's promises of his exodus wonders at Ex 3:20--*kai ekteinas tēn cheira pataxō tous Aigyptious en pasi tois thaumasiois mou*.

[1] See *Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 13,36, and 195.

[2] Discussing Lk 19:9--"Today salvation has come to this house"--Flender observes that the subsequent parable indicates that in Luke's mind, "it is still the day of salvation even if Jesus has been removed into the invisible distance of heaven. It is not simply that the parousia has been postponed, but the present fulfilment of salvation (19:9) and the earthly mission (vv. 13b) change the situation into "redemptive history.'" Flender, *Luke*, 60.

Conzelmann's argument that the today of

distinction between the then of Christ and the now of the church, our study shows Luke as concerned with celebrating the continuity between those times. For Luke, the believer places him/herself within the plan of God, who acts with saving power in a 'today' which embraces both 'then' and 'now.'

Jesus' ministry is relegated by Luke to the past rests mainly on his exegesis of 22:35f (*Theology*, 170), a passage which C. sees as marking off the center of history (Jesus' time) from the era of the church. That exegesis has been challenged most recently and thoroughly by Jean F. Gormley in a Fordham dissertation (1974) which interprets these verses as operating within the structure of the Third Gospel as the "final passion prediction." ["The Final Passion Predictin: A Study in Lk 22: 35-38."]

A similar perspective (i.e., that Jesus inaugurates the new age) informs the commentary of Frederick Danker throughout--*Jesus and the New Age*.

A statement of I. H. Marshall catches Luke's vision well: "Conzelmann's mistake is that he has made a distinction between the ministry of Jesus, which (in his view) Luke has de-eschatologized, and the future time of the End. It is more correct to say that Luke has broadened out the time of the End so that it begins with the ministry of Jesus, includes the time of the church, and is consummated at the parousia. Luke has not pushed the End into the distant future; he has lengthened it to include the whole era of salvation from the time of Jesus onwards. Salvation is not a thing of the past, belonging to the ministry of Jesus. It takes its start from then; the 'today' of fulfilment continues right through into the time of the church." I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Toronto: Home Evangel Books, Ltd., Paternoster Press, 1970), p. 121.

In all of this, Cadbury's critique of Dodd's

XUM

B. The Healing as Christological Sign

Our exegesis in the previous chapter revealed that Luke (and/or the tradition upon which he drew) uses a number of OT types to identify the functional role of Jesus as it is spelled out in Acts 3-4. Sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly, Jesus is compared to Moses and Elijah, and he is called Christos and pais. We can learn from the rest of Luke-Acts how the author means Jesus to be understood with reference to these figures and titles. Then we can ask how the use of this typology in Acts 3-4 informs the meaning of the healing of the man born lame.

1. The Prophet-like-Moses

Twice (at Acts 3:22 and 7:37) Luke cites Dt 18:15 ("God will raise up from your brothers a prophet like me"). The first reference is a specific identification of Jesus as the promised prophet. The second reference, in Stephen's speech, tells us just how Luke wants his readers to understand Moses as a type of Jesus: Moses was sent by God as leader

---

"realized eschatology" is still valid. See "Acts and Eschatology" in the Festschrift honoring C. H. Dodd, p. 315f. It is perhaps best to speak of Luke's "inaugurated" eschatology.

and savior (touton ho theos archonta kai lytrōtēn apestalken, 7:35) and he led his people poiēsas terata kai sēmeia (7:36), and he was disobeyed. Once we have met this specification of the type (Moses), we are ready to see how Luke uses that type to develop Jesus as the antitype: Jesus is archēgos tēs zōēs who was rejected (3:14f; and see 5:31); he had done terata kai semēia (2:2, as it can now be phrased in the Acts context), and wonders and signs are now being done in his name. Finally, now definitively "raised up," he is being sent to wield prophetic authority through his apostles (3:26).[1] As performed in this setting, then, the healing is sign of the Prophet-like-Moses.[2]

---

[1] See the discussion of this verse above, pp. 171ff.

[2] Luke's use of Moses typology is not as dominant as Matthew's, but most commentators agree that the author of Luke-Acts does use Moses as one of his OT models for interpreting Jesus. Besides the Moses typology mentioned above (on which see also F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity, trans. by H. Knight and G. Ogg (New York: World Publishing Co., 1969), pp. 374ff and R. Fuller, Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 168ff), other Mosaic elements to be noted are: the references to God as "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Acts 3:13a; 7:32), recalling the repeated use of that name

John Kilgallen, in his study of the Moses story in Stephen's speech, concludes that Luke wants to point out that the rejection of the prophet leads to false worship (idolatry).[1] Since Moses is here

---

for God at the call and commission of Moses (Ex 2:24; 3:6,15,16; 4:5)--noted also by Fuller (Foundations, p. 168); the references to Jesus as prophet at Lk 24: 19b, 21a, which Hahn sees as related to the typology of Acts 7:35ff (*Titles of Jesus*, p. 376); the choice and mission of the 70 (72) at Lk 10:1 (possibly modelled on Num 11; see S. Wilson, *The Gentiles*, pp. 45ff, for a recent review of this question); C. F. Evans sees the travel section of the Third Gospel as patterned according to Mosaic material of Deuteronomy (referred to with approval in Hahn, *Titles*, p. 387). Further, a case can be made that the title *pais* as applied to Jesus in Acts 3-4, may be intended chiefly in the sense of Prophet-like-Moses (to be discussed below in section 4).

Part and parcel of the New Moses motif is the use of *ekklēsia* as a designation for the Jerusalem community. This has been discussed most recently by P. Zingg (*Das Wachsen der Kirche*, p. 154), who observes:

> *Ekklēsia*, used in the LXX for the cultic assembly during the desert period (Dt 4:10, 9:10; 18:16; 31:30) is also used in Stephen's speech in this sense (8:38) *en tē$_i$ ekklēsia en tē$_i$ erēmō$_i$*. Otherwise it is used in Acts mainly for the Jerusalem church, 5:11; 8:3; 12:1,5; 15:4,22. The typological reference in the citation of 7:37 (Dt 18:15; cf. Acts 3:22f) to Jesus as the new Moses shows that the church sees itself in continuity with the people of the desert period. Thus, the self-understanding of the Hellenistic part of the community as the true Israel is reflected in the Deuteronomic coloring of the term *ekklēsia*. (Trans. mine.)

[1] John Kilgallen, S.J. *A Literary and*

XUM

presented as a Christological type, perhaps this motif provides the background for understanding what is at stake in Acts 3-4. The movement from seeking silver and gold (the typical components of idols) to accepting the Prophet-like-Moses--and moving into true worship in the temple--this movement acts out the saving option open to Israel.

2. Latter Day Elijah?

Mark and Matthew present John the Baptist as antitype of Elijah. Although Luke pays his respects to that tradition by referring to John as "coming in the spirit and power of Elijah" (Lk 1:17),[1] he elsewhere

---

Redactional Study of Acts 7:2-53 (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1974), p. 57.

[1] In his thorough review of the use of Elijah typology in Luke-Acts, Jean-Daniel Dubois presents a satisfactory integration of Lk 1:17 with Luke's apparent interest in dissociating John the Baptist from Elijah typology. He notes that Luke avoids using the apokatastētei of Mal 3:23 and has epistrephai instead. But what is more important, since the whole portrait of John the Baptist in Luke has a christological function, we do well to interpret Lk 1:17 christologically. "John the Baptist 'will go before him,' Jesus, to prepare the way of the Messiah (Lk 3:3ff; 7:27ff). With the expression 'the Spirit and power of Elijah'--a reference to an Old Testament prophet and, moreover, to a gift of the Holy Spirit given by Jesus--Luke made John the Baptist the first prophet of the primitive church." J.-D.Dubois, "La figure d'Élie dans la perspective Lucannienne," Revue d'histoire et philosophie religieuses 53 (1973): 155-176.

shows a constant concern to excise from the tradition such associations of the Baptist with Elijah: he omits the Marcan notice regarding John's Elijah-like garb (1:6; par., Mt 3:5), the dialogue about Elijah on the way down from the mount of the transfiguration (Mk 9:11), and the taunt under the cross (Mk 15:35). Nor does Luke carry the statement found in Mt 11:14 which identifies John the Baptist with Elijah. On the other hand, Luke is quite ready to surround Jesus with associations from the Elijah-Elisha cycle: the Lucan material at 4:25ff implicitly compares Jesus' ministry to "outsiders" with the ministries of Elijah and Elisha. And the account of the raising at Nain (Lk 7:11ff) recalls in several specifics the resuscitations of Elijah and Elisha (Lk 7:11ff has in common with 3 Kgd 17:17ff the raising of a widow's son and the reference that the healer eidoken auton tē$_i$ mētri autou [3 Kgd 17:23; Lk 7:15] and it has in common with 4 Kgd 4 a location [Nain is near Shunem]). And Luke's story of the healing of the ten lepers is like Elisha's cure of Naaman in that a foreign leper is cleansed in an act of obedience (4 Kgd: bathe in the river; Lk: show yourselves to the priests) and returns praising God (4 Kgd 5:15; Lk 17:15).[1]

---

[1] Dubois' study ("La figure d'Élie") includes all of the above observations. Along with these, he

XUM

This effort of Luke's to associate Jesus with the Elijah figure suggests several things. First, such an association provides a context of understanding the apokatastasis pantōn of Acts 3:21 as an allusion to the expected Elijan restoration envisioned in Mal 3:22ff and surfacing in the synoptic tradition at Mk 9:11f and Mt 17:11f, so that Jesus' ministry (and that of his disciples) can be understood as the beginning of the end-time restoration.[1] Second, by associating

---

also notes the following contacts between the Lucan portrait of Jesus and the Elijah cycle: in the Lucan transfiguration Moses and Elijah speak with Jesus about his "exodus to be accomplished in Jerusalem: (Lk 9:31; cf. 4 Kgd 2:8--Elijah's own personal exodus); Luke's portrait of Jesus' final journey mirrors that of Elijah (Gilgal to the Jordan, 4 Kgd 2:1) in that it moves from Samaria to Jerusalem: both journeys end in an ascension, called, in both cases an analēmpsis (see 4 Kgd 2:9,10,11; Sir 48:49 for Elijah; and Acts 1:2,11,22 for Jesus); the fire imagery which John applies to Jesus' ministry (Lk 3:17) and by which Jesus refers to the baptism of his death (Lk 12:49f) recall 3 Kgd 18:38 and 4 Kgd 1:10,12); Elijah's retreat to the desert (3 Kgd 19:6-8), and the 40 days trek (3 Kgd 19:8), comprise a possible background to the temptation account (Lk 4:1ff)[the motif of angelic help is even clearer at Lk 22:43].

[1] In summarizing the Jewish expectation regarding Elijah as eschatological prophet, Jeremias can say, "His task is that of apokatastasis." He notes that the LXX of Mal 3:23 extends the restoration of the mutual relations of all members of the people (hos apokatastēsei kardian patros pros huion kai kardian anthrōpou pros ton plēsion autou). "In succeeding generations this was variously expounded. One interpretation is that he preaches repentance . . . 'Without repentance Israel will not be redeemed . . . They will do great penance only when Elijah comes' [Pirqe R. Eli'ezer, 43; cf. 4 Esr 6:26]." Jeremias notes, further, "Sir 48:10 adds to the twofold task of Mal, i.e.,

the ministries of Jesus and the disciples with the Elijah-Elisha cycle, Luke can exploit a familiar OT relationship to interpret the relationship between Jesus and the disciples: Jesus is to the disciples as Elijah was to Elisha. Implication: the Twelve (i.e., the Eleven restored to the Twelve) are the prophetic successors to Jesus, are endowed with his Spirit, and do works like their master's.[1] Third, in

---

mitigating the wrath of Yahweh before the judgment (Mal 4:5,6b), and turning the heart of the father to the son (4:6a), the third task of restoring the tribes of Israel. There is thus attributed to the returning Elijah a task which 2 Is ascribes to the servant of the Lord (Is 49:6)." (J. Jeremias, "*Hel(e)ias*, *TDNT* 2:931.)

Given such close associations of restoration with Elijah, it is hard to conceive of Luke's using the word *apokatastasis* unless the Elijan connotations were compatible with his intention. The suggestion within this study is that the risen Lord is seen to fulfil the expectations associated with Elijah, precisely through repentance and, thereby, the restoration of the faithful end-time Israel.

[1] Max Wilcox makes an observation that may be pertinent here about *anastēnai epi tous podas* at Acts 14:10. Arguing against this idiom as a septuagintalism, Wilcox notes that it occurs only twice in the LXX (4 Kgd 13:21 and 1 Chron 28:2) but his comment suggests more than his argument. "If, then, the idiom were due to the influence of the LXX, it would probably have to be taken as an allusion to 4 Kgd 13:21, where the point in question is the healing power of Elisha's bones." *The Semitisms of Acts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 133. Wilcox thinks this unlikely since the passage does not occur in the reconstructed testimonia of Dodd. But testimonia are one thing, allusions something else. Is it not possible that Luke sees in the "apostolic" healing a further working out of Elishan power?

XUM

the context of this Elijah-Elisha association, the healing of the man-born-lame (explicitly interpreted by the speeches as salvation and restoration to wholeness) is readily understood as a *sign* that the *apokatastasis* expected with the return of Elijah is now beginning through the ministry of the apostles in the name of Jesus.[1]

---

[1] That this particular healing story is an apt one for signaling a fulfilment of the Elijah expectation is suggested by the presence of the leaping motif in the context of the Malachi passage about restoration:

> "But to you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise [cf. Lk 1:78: *en hois episkepsetai hēmas anatolē ex hypsous*] and healing in his wings [*iasis en tais pteryxin autou*] and you shall go forth and leap [*skirtēsete*] as young calves let loose from bands [*ek desmōn*]." Mal 3:20ff.

Luke, alone among the NT authors, uses the word *skirtaō*--at Lk 1:41,44 (where it refers to the fetal leaping of John the Baptist and, if LXX allusion is intended, would seem to refer more to Gn 25:22--the fetal leaping of Jacob and E Rebecca--and/or 2 Kgd 6:15 [Symmachus]--David leaping before the ark of the covenant--than to Mal 4:2) and Lk 6:23. Although the words for the leaping of the healed cripple are different (*hallomai* and *exallomai*), leaping is leaping; and once one returns to this source of the saying about Elijah restoring (Mal 3), it is easy to understand the emphatic leaping motif of Acts 3:8 as an embodiment of the leaping associated with the Elijah restoration. It is not impossible that such was Luke's intention.

The material summarized by Ginzberg--*Legends*, 4.233ff--may provide further clues regarding the appropriateness of using Elijah typology for Jesus: "Elijah's preparatory work will be begun three days before the advent of the Messiah. Then he will appear in Palestine, and will utter a lament over the devastation of the Holy Land, and his wail will be heard through the world. The last words of his elegy will be 'Now peace will come upon earth!'" This is very suggestive of Lk 13, where Jesus speaks of three final

XUM

3. The Anointed

It is "in the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene" that Peter commands the lame man to walk. Since so much is made of 'the name' in Acts 3-4, we must presume that the specific form the name takes here is not a matter of indifference. The title Christos is carefully nuanced in the larger context of Luke-Acts to name Jesus both as Davidic king and as Mosaic prophet.

It is in the resurrection that Jesus is "raised up" as king to fulfil the promise of the annunciation (Lk 1:32) that he would possess the throne of his father David. Acts 2:30 and 13:33-35 proclaim this quite clearly. And Acts 2:29-36 speak of that Davidic fulfilment with reference to the title ho Christos.[1]

Thus, Luke clearly intends to reaffirm the tradition of the royal dimension of ho Christos as the name of Jesus.[2] But along with this emphasis he shows a special interest in the prophetic dimension of that title.

---

days of his ministry and then goes on to lament over Jerusalem. Note, too, the reference to wings, common to both Luke 13 and Mal 3:20.

[1] For a discussion of the Nathan oracle of 2 Sam 7 as background to the Christology of Luke-Acts, see Otto Betz, "The Kerygma of St. Luke," Interpretation 22 (1968):131-46.

[2] Mussner ("Die Idee," p. 302) finds in the

As was noted in chapter two,[1] the use of *Christos* at the outset of his ministry, in the demonic confession at Lk 4:41, confirms that Jesus' ministry of word and deed is to be understood as the work of the "christed" prophet (4:18, *echrisen*; cf. Acts 4:27 and 10:38).[2]

Acts 3:20, in specifying *ho Christos* as being apointed and sent, thereby uses the title in a way that applies to prophetic mission. It is, after all, not kings who are chosen and sent, but prophets.[3]

---

prophetic references to the eschatological David a connection with the restoration motif. He notes specifically Jer 30:9 [the restoration is developed in terms of healing in vv. 12-17]; Jer 33:15-26; Ez 34:23f [David set as shepherd over the restored people]: Zech 12:7-12; 13:1; Hos 3:5.

[1] Pp. 24ff.

[2] It is significant, in this respect, that Jesus applies the *iatre* "parable" to himself in the speech of 4:18ff and then follows it up with references to the ministries of Elijah and Elisha (involving a raising and a cleansing from leprosy). All of this must be read with the Isaiah quote in mind. It is part of the same package presenting Jesus as an anointed prophet through whom God heals and liberates--despite opposition.

[3] As background to appointing and sending in Acts 3:20, Bruce Vawter points to Ex 4:13 LXX (*kai eipen Mōysēs, deomai, Kyrie, procherisai dynamenon allon, hon aposteleis*): "All of this builds up to an appropriate climax in verse 22, when the Christ is explicitly identified with the eschatological rophet-like-Moses who was awaited in postexilic Jewish expectation as the fulfillment of Deuteronomy 18:15. Though Jesus' role, or coming role, is characterized by use of the Davidic title, in this catechesis there is no longer any residue of royal messianism, which has been completely replaced by a prophetic soteriology." *This*

XUM

All of this strongly suggests that *Christos*, as used in our section, whether as part of the name involved (Acts 3:6; 4:10) or as the identity of Jesus (3:18,20; 4:26), ties into Luke's special interest in that title as a designation of Jesus sent as prophet.[1]

4. *Pais*

Apart from Mt 12:18 (the quotation of Is 42:1), *pais*, as a title of Jesus, appears in the NT only four times--all in the section of our special interest (Acts 3:13,26; 4:27,30). Against the common interpretation of *pais* as a reference to the servant of Second Isaiah, Cadbury argues that the term is too generally used in the LXX to assign a specific reference to it.[2] Moule warns that we should not consider the four uses of *pais*

Man Jesus: An Essay toward A New Testament Christology (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1973), p. 93.

To this we may note that, in the Exodus context, the God who sends prophets identifies himself as the master of sickness and health: *Eipe de Kyrios pros Mōysēn tis edōkenstoma anthrōpō*$_i$ *kai tis epoiēse dis-kophon kai kōphon; bleponta kai typhlon; ouk egō ho Theos*; (Ex 4:11).

[1] W. C. Van Unnik sees the title Christ in Luke-Acts operating primarily as prophetic. See "Jesus the Christ," *NTS* 8 (1961):101-116.

J. Daniélou observes that the Christology of the speeches in Acts aims mainly at witnessing that Jesus is the servant of God's plan. The title "Christ" is to be taken "in the most obvious sense of the instrument of God's design." *L'Église des Actes des Apôtres*, p. 62. See also Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus*, p. 381.

[2] *Beginnings*, vol 5, Additional Note 29.

for Jesus in Acts 3 and 4 as a block but rather that we should observe that at least 3:13 (and 3:26, echoing it) is quite possibly a clear allusion to Is 53, and that the uses of _pais_ in Acts 4 refer to the royal Davidic servant in Jewish liturgy (as in Did 9).[1]

As we noted in chapter four, 3:13 is very likely an allusion to the OT (the phrase _edoxasen ton paida autou_ and the context of amazement and vindication are common to both Acts 3 and Is 52:13ff). But it is possible that the allusion refers to the servant not primarily as _suffering_ servant but as suffering _servant_. And the other three references to Jesus as _pais_ support this possibility.[2] At Acts 3:26,[3] _anastēsas ho theos ton paida_, as an interpetation of the resurrection of Jesus as the fulfilment of Dt 18, uses _pais_ in the sense of prophet.[4] When, in 4:27, Jesus is called _ton hagion paida_, the immediate context is the royal psalm, Ps 2, and so the immediate reference here is to Jesus anointed as Davidic king. But 4:30 seems to shift the typology back to the prophet inasmuch as it refers to Jesus as a pais like Moses, as is suggested by the request for sēmeia kai terata to be done in his name. It is evident, then, that pais functions in Acts very much like the title Christos. It points to Jesus as instrument fulfilling the plan of God--as Davidic king, to be sure, but also as Prophet-like-Moses.[1]

---

[1] _Studies in Luke-Acts_, pp. 169f.

[2] David is called _pais_ in Acts 4:25 not only because he is servant/king but also because God spoke through his mouth, that is, he uses him as a prophet speaking through Ps 2. See also Acts 3:21 for this way of speaking about prophets. See also 2:30, where David is explicitly called _prophētēs_.

[3] See Discussion above, pp. 172f.

[4] For a similar interpretation of 3:26, see M. Rese, _Alttestamentliche Motive_, pp. 195f; J. Dupont, "Les discours," p. 344; J. Daniélou, _L'Église_, p. 62; Fuller, _Foundations_, p. 169; and Hahn, _Titles_, pp. 375f.

The christology of the immediate context of the healing of the cripple--Jesus seen as the Prophet-like-Moses, the one fulfilling Elijan hopes (though no Elijah *redivivus*), the Christ as anointed prophet--all of this stresses that what Peter and John do here is an extension of the prophetic mission of Jesus. The context emphasizes that these pillar apostles function as successors to the Prophet Jesus. What we have, then, is "christology" for the sake of "ecclesiology." The next section will unfold that aspect of Luke's interpretation of the healing.

---

[1] Conzelmann argues that the connection of *pais* with the Servant of the Lord in Second Isaiah is not brought out, since the notion of substitution is lacking (*Theology*, pp. 174f). Our study has shown that an implicit connection is present--not, indeed, servant as vicarious victim but servant as prophet speaking the word of God to Israel and the nations. Conzelmann asserts in a number of other places--see *Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 166f, n. 3; 167; and 172, n. 1--that Luke is not interested in typology. Our discussion suggests quite the opposite.

C. The Healing as Ecclesiological Sign

If this sign of healing proclaims Jesus as the definitive end-time Prophet, it is also an inaugural sign through which God identifies the apostolic community as the authentic successors of Jesus. His prophetic mission becomes their prophetic mission. Luke spells out the relationship between those two missions in a variety of ways. Although he would not have used such categories, he appears to see the two missions as _analogous_, _successive_ (with respect to the historical Jesus), and _identical_ (with respect to the risen Lord).[1]

1. The Missions as Analogous

The Macroparallelism

Luke presents the two missions as analogous by drawing parallels between them. Perhaps the major signal of this parallelism is expressed in the anatomy of Luke-Acts as a whole. Both Luke and Acts begin[2] by focusing on identity question. The Third Gospel begins the mission of Jesus with his "anointing" by the Holy Spirit (in which he is called Son of God); then follows the genealogy (showing how his human genealogy mediates his being son of Adam, son of God); then, led by the Spirit, his identity is tested by Satan; then, again led by the Spirit, he comes to give his inaugural speech at Nazareth (where Is 61 is used to interpret the meaning of the baptism);[1] and into this speech Luke incorporates Elijah-Elisha material. The whole section, then, from the baptism in chapter 3 through the prophetic material in chapter 4, focuses on Jesus' identity as prophet. In a parallel way, Acts presents the development of the apostolic mission: the restoration of the Eleven to the Twelve focuses on their authenticity as witnesses (even as the initial chapters of the gospel establish the authenticity of Jesus' origin as Davidic heir); then follows their baptism in the Spirit[2] (Acts 2:1-4), which is interpreted by a

---

[1] To clarify at the outset terminology that may be confusing: note that the first two terms ('analogous' and 'successive') refer to the earthly mission of Jesus and the post-Easter mission of the church as distinct from one another; whereas the third term, 'identical,' refers to the mission of Jesus as risen Lord and the mission of the church as one and the same--literally identical.

[2] For a careful discussion of Luke's deliberate

---

use of arché and archomai in delineating the two major beginnings of Jesus' ministry and that of the church, see E. Samain, "La notion de ARCHĒ dans l'oeuvre lucanienne," in Neirynck, ed., L'Évangile de Luc.

[1] Acts 10:38 (echrisen auton ho theos pneumati hagiō kai dynamei) helps us see that echrisen of Lk 4:18 (Is 61:1) is meant to interpret the coming down of the Holy Spirit at Lk 3:22.

[2] So termed at Acts 11:15f.

scripture quotation (2:17-21) referring to their prophetic identity; there follows a testing of the community, including a specific reference to Satan (5:1-11). This macroparallelism between the Lucan presentation of the two missions sets the reader up for further, more nuanced articulations of that parallelism.[1]

---

[1] The most recent investigation of the architectonic patterns of Luke-Acts is Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBL Monograph Series, 20 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974). To clarify and confirm our discussion, it may be useful to reproduce here his schema of the balance he finds between the beginnings of both books:

LUKE	ACTS
1:1-4 A preface dedicates the book to Theophilus.	1:1-5 A preface dedicates the book to Theophilus.
3:21 Jesus is praying at his baptism.	1:14,24 The disciples are praying as they await their baptism of the Holy Spirit.
4:16-30 Jesus' ministry opens with a sermon which gives the theme for what follows, fulfillment of prophecy and rejection of Jesus.	2:14-40 The church's ministry opens with a sermon which gives the theme for what follows, fulfillment of prophecy and rejection of Jesus.
4:31-8:56 The theme of fulfillment mentioned in 4:16-30 is illustrated by examples of preaching and healing. Conflicts illustrate the note of rejection.	2:41-12:17 The theme of fulfillment is illustrated by examples of prophesying and wonders. Persecutions illustrate the note of unbelief.

Talbert further elaborates correspondence within this last general section:

5:17-26 A lame man is	3:1-10 A lame man is

XUM

Word and Work in Tandem

As we have observed frequently above, Luke is careful to maintain a consistent coordination of word and work, chiefly healing. This occurs both in the description of Jesus' actions and in the missionary charges, but especially in the section of our special interest (Acts 3-4), where the two coordinate gifts of parrēsia and healing are illustrated, both in the actions of the apostles and in the prayer of the community.

Signs of Contradiction

"This sign of healing" is clearly presented as a sign of contradiction. All, authorities as well as the people, accept it as genuine, but while many are converted, the authorities choose not to be "convinced." In this respect, too, the apostolic healing works much like the healings of Jesus. Compare, for example, Luke's treatment of Israel's response in Lk 19:37-44 with the way in which the healing of one lame man leads to the "fall and rise of many in Israel" in Acts 3-4--i.e., the leaders who, on this occasion, reject Christ (4:11) and

---

healed by the authority of Jesus.	healed by the name of Jesus (cf. 9:32-35).
5:29-6:11 Conflicts with the religious leaders.	4:1-8:3 Conflicts with the religious leaders.

(The scheme is on p. 16 of Talbert.)

XUM

threaten the apostles (4:18,29) vs. the mass of people who believe (4:4) and praise God for what had happened (4:2).[1]

The Agency of ho theos

The primacy of the action of God, so pronounced in the picture of the apostles' mission in Acts 3 and 4, reflects Luke's treatment of both missions throughout Luke-Acts. The summary interpretations of Jesus' ministry (Lk 13:32 [teleioumai]; Acts 2:22; 10:38) and those of the apostolic ministry (Acts 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 14:3; 15:12) are presented as ratified by God through signs and wonders. We also observed this in the "instrumental" christology embodied in the Lucan portrayal of Jesus as the Christ, the pais theou, and the Prophet-like-Moses. Ho theos is the primary agent in a new exodus begun in Jesus and continued through the apostles. The healing of Acts 3:1-10 in particular shows the apostles as merely instrumental; it is a sign gegonen di'autou (4:16).[2]

---

[1] See, too, the discussion above on the pattern of responses, pp. 73-79.

[2] Talbert's observation on the correspondence of Lk 5:17-26 to Acts 3:1-10 is pertinent in this regard: "It is perhaps significant that though Luke 5:17-26 comes basically from Mark 2:1-12, the evangelist does compose his own introduction to the Marcan tradition, that is Luke 5:17, in which he says "the power of the Lord was with him to heal." This introductory phrase has the effect of emphasizing that the subsequent

Both Missions Vindicated despite Persecution

What Haenchen[1] calls a "rift" between Acts 4:28 and 4:29 may be a more graceful transition than he thinks: verses 27ff do indeed refer to the passion of Jesus and v. 29 to the persectuion of the church. But perhaps Luke does not smooth out the seam precisely because he sees an analogy between those two persecutions--the upshot will be the same: God, who vindicated his servant Jesus will also vindicate these servants. The "second Pentecost" which ensues (4:31) is a confirmation of this.

The Qumran document 4QFlor provides an analogue to this application of Ps 2 to a group that identifies it self as the eschatological community.[2] This precedent makes it at least plausible that the Christians also applied this text to themselves--but with an important difference: whereas the Qumran covenanters saw the text as univocally fulfilled in their existence,

---

healing was due to divine power. It is precisely this emphasis that we find in Acts 3:12-26 where in a speech Peter is made to interpret the previous healing miracle. 'Why do you stare at us, as though by our own power or piety we had made him walk?' The emphasis is on the divine power in the healing." Literary Patterns, p. 19.

[1] Haenchen, Acts, p. 228.

[2] See above, p. .

the Christians (or, at least Luke) understood it as fulfilled first in Jesus, and then, analogously, in themselves. At least the prayer asks for a similar vindication.

Both Missions Fulfilment of Scripture

> Luke 24:46f--Thus it is written,
> that the Christ should suffer
> and on the third day rise
> from the dead,
> and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached
> in his name to all the nations--

asserts that, along with the death and resurrection of Jesus, the mission of the church fulfils scripture. If we wonder what specific OT passages are fulfilled in the church's mission, some examples are provided in the speeches of Paul in Acts. Luke (at Acts 13:47) boldly climaxes Paul's inaugural speech at Pisidian Antioch with an application of Is 49:6 to the church's mission.[1] Similarly, the quotation of Hab 1:5 at Acts 13:41 is applied to the preaching mission. And the use of Is 55:3 LXX at Acts 13:34 turns out to be profoundly suggestive in its Isaian context, which speaks of testimony to the Gentiles (Is 55:4) and the forgiveness of sins (Is 55:7). Again, Paul's third retelling of his conversion (this time at Caesarea, before Festus and Agrippa), Jesus' instructions to him are cast in what appears to be an allusion to Is 42--"to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me" (cf. Acts 26:18 with Is 42:7,16). A subsequent part of that speech (which will be examined in greater detail below) not only presents the mission as fulfilling scripture but also boldly proclaims it as the continuation of Jesus' own mission (Acts 26:22b,23).[1]

---

[1] In its Isaian context, 49:6b, presented as the restoration of the tribes of Jacob. Other OT passages used or alluded to in Luke-Acts which also have this two-step process: Amos 9:11f at Acts 15:16 (first the house of David is rebuilt, then the Gentiles seek the Lord) and Ezechiel 17:23 alluded to in the mustard seed parable (first the tree of Israel is transplanted, then the tree hosts the birds of the nations).

---

[1] Still other OT texts which might be understood as fulfilled in the mission of the church: Ps 2:8: "Ask of me and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession." This text is not quoted; but since the community of Acts 4 invokes Ps 2, perhaps the infilling with Spirit and the parrēsia to preach the word can be seen as a fulfilment of Ps 2:8.

Is 53:7f LXX, quoted at Acts 8:32f, is another possibility. Haenchen (in loc.) notes that the LXX phrasing is open to the meaning hē krisis autou ērthē as a reference to resurrection and that the remainder of the verse means "the number of his disciples will grow incalculably, because he has become the Exalted." The Isaian text, then, as quoted, would cover death, resurrection, exaltation, and the growth of the post-Easter church.

Some further indications of parallelism: The story of Dives and Lazarus contains an implicit analogy between the preaching of Moses, of Jesus, and of the

All of these ways by which Luke indicates the analogy, or parallelism, between the mission of Jesus and the mission of the apostolic church[1] serve to help

---

church. "But he [Dives] said, 'No Father Abraham, but if someone comes from the dead to them, 'If they will not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced [peisthēsontai] if someone should rise from the dead'" (Lk 16:30f). In the immediate context of the parable, of course, this applies to the hypothetical return of Dives. But in the larger context of Luke-Acts, this complex of ideas--Abraham, hearing Moses and the prophets, *metanoia*, one rising from the dead *peithein*--all of this is the vocabulary of mission in Acts [most of them appear in the speech of Peter in Solomon's Portico]. Inasmuch as this is a parable spoken by Jesus addressing the money-loving Pharisees (at least as understood by Luke in his editing; cf. Lk 16:14f), the implication is that Jesus' call to conversion is consonant with the teaching of Moses and the prophets. But there is a further, more important parallelism: the reference to being "convinced" if "one should rise from the dead," with its mission language, implies an analogy between the mission of the church with that of Jesus. Both are a call to conversion which is to express itself one's sharing of material goods.

G. W. H. Lampe observes a calculated parallelism in Luke's juxtaposition of the resuscitation accounts with mission episodes: "It is probably by design that Luke sets up the mission of the Twelve, not in Mark's context of rejection at Nazareth, but directly after the great miracle of resurrection (the raising of Jairus' daughter), at a moment of triumph rather than after a decisive reverse, just as the explanation of Jesus' own mission, given to John's envoys, follows immediately upon the resurrection at Nain." "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles," in C.F.D. Moule, ed., *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History* (London: A.R.Mowbray and Co., Ltd., 1965), pp. 165-178.

[1] Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, p. 124, n. 1, suggests an analogy (undemonstrated) between the earthly life of Jesus and the future kingdom, but overlooks the parallelism between the ministries of Jesus and the church.

XUM

us understand the healing of the temple beggar as a sign that Peter and Paul are being launched (divine passive intended) on a mission like that of Jesus--working deeds that are signs for the fall and rise of many, empowered by the Spirit of God, vindicated despite persecution, mirroring their master, fulfilling scripture, speaking boldly as prophets challenging to conversion.

2. The Missions as Successive

Just as Luke is at pains to elaborate the similarity between the missions of Jesus and the church, he is also bent on indicating the source of that similarity: the members of the apostolic community are the legitimate prophetic successors to Jesus. Whereas the other synoptists are content to leave their picture of the ministry of the church implicit in their portrait of the words and works of Jesus, Luke's project is to make the relationship between the two missions quite explicit. The two are not vaguely related through temporal overlap or personal association; the disciples succeed Jesus and now teach and act with his authority.[1]

---

[1] Indeed, Charles Talbert calls Luke-Acts a succession narrative. After reviewing the succeesion motif as it is employed in classical literature, Talbert suggests that "as Luke sees it, there is a succession from Jesus to the twelve to Paul to the Ephesian elders. The Christians have a 'professorial succession' for their 'school' just as the Platonists

XUM

Distinctness: to Emphasize Succession

In order to portray succession, Luke must more clearly establish distinctness: first there was Jesus' mission, then came that of his successors. Granted the temporal overlapping (when the disciples shared in Jesus' public ministry), the fulness of the mission of the successors is not established until Pentecost. Accordingly, Luke emphasizes the distinctness even in his presentation of Jesus' earthly ministry.

As we observed in our study of the Lucan presentation of the beginning of Jesus' public life in Lk 4, the third evangelist, unlike Matthew and Mark, has Jesus begin alone, unaccompanied by disciples.

It is instructive to compare Luke's way of schematizing the calls and commissions of the disciples with the schemes of Mark and Matthew. Mark has three distinct moments, each initiating a new section: the call of the four (1:16-20), the appointment of the Twelve (3:13-19), and the commissioning and instruction

---

and the Pharisees do for theirs. In this way the Evangelist furnishes the certainty he had promised Theophilus (Luke 1:4) in categories intelligible to a citizen of the Greco-Roman world." "Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian," p. 200. Along with this passing on of doctrine is the factor of "lived succession": the follower learned to live as the founding teacher and thereby embodied his doctrine in his life. Perhaps here is the model for the stylized emphasis on a balance between word and work in Luke-Acts. For a more recent development of his research on this matter, see Talbert's Lucan Patterns, pp. 125-136.

of the Twelve (6:7-13). Matthew does this in two moments: the call of the four (Mt 4:23-25) and his conflation of the appointment with the commission/ instruction (10:1-15, plus the missionary discourse, which fills out the rest of chapter 10). In contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke has four moments: first, the call of the first disciples (here the inner three, centered on Peter, in association with the miraculous draft of fish, 5:1-11); second, the choosing of the Twelve from the disciples (6:12-16; he names them apostles but includes no mention of their teaching and healing functions yet); third, the commission of the Twelve to preach and heal (9:1-6); and, fourth, the appointment/commission/instruction of the seventy-two (10:1-12).[1] If the mission of the seventy-two is a proleptic presentation of the church's mission, then Luke's point in associating this discipleship material with the seventy-two is to indicate that even these disciples beyond the circle of the Twelve will be part of the authentic missions.

Luke's treatment of Jesus' reply to the embassy of John the Baptist is another example of his interest in distinguishing so as to later highlight this dynamic of succession. In two ways Luke takes what Mt 11:2 describes globally as ta erga tou Christou (the messianic works of both Jesus and his disciples)[1] and appears to deal with them as the works of the ministry of Jesus alone: (1) Luke omits the commission to preach and heal (cf. Mk 3:14f) in his version of the call of the Twelve (6:12-16; he saves the commission to preach and heal for 9:2f) and (2) he refers to the healing which Jesus did en ekeinē$_i$ tē$_i$ hōra$_i$ (7:21). That is, what Matthew treats globally, Luke spaces out more distinctly--first the hour of Jesus, then the work of the apostles.

---

[1] Note that Luke here collates discipleship material which Matthew uses elsewhere in connection with the Twelve: the no-excuses pericope, Lk 9:57ff, and the woes over the Galilean cities, 10:13-15.

Luke seems to think of the Johannine baptism in the Holy Spirit as two beginnings in the course of a continuous divine mission. This is especially evident in the language of some of the Petrine speeches. Speaking of the requirements for candidacy in the replacement of Judas, Peter asserts that "he must be one of those who were in our group during the whole time that the Lord Jesus travelled about with us beginning from the baptism of John until the day of his being taken up" (Acts 1:21f). From the perspective of the apostolic witness, then, Jesus' mission begins after the baptism of John. Again, in his report to the

---

[1] See H. Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories," p. 252.

Jerusalem community about the experience with Cornelius, Peter says that "the Holy Spirit fell upon them just as he did upon us at the beginning (*hōsper kai eph'hēmas en archēi*)" 11:15. The next verse makes it clear that the *archē* in question is their own experience on Pentecost. Strikingly, Peter goes on to describe this time as the moment when they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, making it quite clear that, at least according to the understanding of Luke, it took the resurrection and the gift of the Spirit before the disciples "believed in the Lord Jesus Christ." And so the share of the Twelve in the pre-Pentecost ministry of Jesus was all apprenticeship; only what followed Pentecost was a ministry of fully qualified successors.

The Apostles to Jesus as Elisha to Elijah

In our survey of the christological motifs of Acts 3 and 4, and in Luke-Acts as a whole, we saw that, while he avoids calling Jesus Elijah *redivivus*, Luke has associated some Elijah typology with Jesus (shifting it away from John the Baptist)--and this for purposes both christological (Jesus is the definitive prophet) and eschatological (the end-time restoration traditionally associated with Elijah has in fact begun in Jesus). As we suggested briefly earlier, the Elijah typology also has "ecclesiological" implications.

This Elijah-Elisha typology has been extended to the disciples in a variety of ways: (1) Just as Elisha's most specific imitation of his master was the resuscitation of the son of the Shunammite woman (4 Kgd 4:18ff), so Peter, like his master, performs a resuscitation Acts 9:36-43), which is narrated with many details reminiscent of the raising performed by Elisha. (2) To the Q material which Matthew has at Mt 8:18-22, presenting the promise of discipleship ("I will follow") and the excuse ("Lord, let me first go and bury my father"), Luke adds a third item ("I will follow you, Lord; but let me first say farewell to those at my home") together with an answer of Jesus ("No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God"). Although the content and spirit are quite different, both the request to return and say good-bye and the reference to plowing are reminiscent of Elijah's call of Elisha (3 Kgd 19:19ff); James' and John's request at 9:54 ("Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them?") might also have been inspired by the Elijah/Elisha narrative (3 Kgd 18:38; 4 Kgd 1:10ff.). (3) The baptism of the Holy Spirit which Jesus receives is referred to as an anointing in Lk 4:18, Acts 4:27 and 10:38; it would seem that the baptism in the Holy Spirit of the 120 in Acts 2 is presented as a similar anointing.

This, too, has interesting parallels in the Elijah cycle: the prophetic succession of Elijah/Elisha is spoken of both as an anointing (*kai ton Elisaie huion Saphat . . . chriseis eis prophētēn anti sou*, 3 Kgd 19:16) and as a giving of Spirit (4 Kgd 2:10,15); moreover, this transition happens around the time of an *analēmpsis* (4 Kgd 2:11).[1]

It would appear, then, that Luke's use of the Elijah/Elisha typology is calculated. It is not impossible that this Old Testament model has been enlisted to present the apostolic community as the prophetic successors of Jesus. This has been achieved mainly in two ways: (1) by distinctly separating the mission of Jesus from that of the disciples and (2) by using the analogy--the apostles were to Jesus as Elisha to Elijah.

---

[1] It is naturally to be expected in any career of discipleship that there would first be a moment of initial call and then, subsequently, a formal commissioning and transferral of power. But even granting that expected course of events, there may well be a stylized typological relationship between the moments of Elijah's call of Elisha (3 Kgd 19:19ff) and Elijah's "commissioning" of Elisha (4 Kgd 2:9ff) and the similar moments in Jesus' training of the disciples.

The description of Elijah in Sir 48:1ff provides an important background to this discussion. Note especially the references to Elijah's anointing prophets to succeed after him (v. 8) and restoring the tribes of Jacob (v. 10).

XUM

But Luke is not finished. The apostolic mission is not only analogous to, and in authentic succession to that of Jesus; it is also _identical_ with Jesus' mission. The word and action of the church is also the word and action of the risen Lord. What is a truism of later Christian missiology turns out to have explicit expression in the text of Luke-Acts.

3. _The Missions as Identical_

Besides the saying of the risen Lord, "I am Jesus (of Nazareth) whom you persecute" (9:5; 22:8; 26:15), the texts which deal with the identity of the missions of Jesus and the church are Acts 3:26; 13:38; 26:23 (cf.26:18 w.26:23--both having Is 42 in common).

In our discussion of Acts 3:26 in the previous chapter, we argued that the participle _anastēsas_ was deliberately ambiguous--referring both to resurrection and prophetic vocation, indeed interpreting Jesus' resurrection as the moment of his definitive prophetic mission, now worked through the mediation of the church. The context of the rest of Peter's speech in Solomon's Portico (it is an offer of blessing which is being sent to the listeners _now_, i.e., after, and because of, the resurrection) allows this interpretation, and other texts in Acts confirm it.

XUM

Work of Apostles Still Work of Jesus

In his inaugural speech at Pisidian Antioch, Paul proclaims: *gnōston oun estō hymin, andres adelphoi, hoti dia toutou hymin aphesis hamartiōn katangelletai* . . . (13:38a). The antecedent of *toutou* is clearly Jesus and the syntax makes it most probable that what is happening "through him" is the announcement of forgiveness of sins.[1]

Clearest of all is the statement of Paul in Acts 26:23: *ei pathētos ho Christos, ei prōtos ex anastaseōs nekrōn phōs mellei katangellein tō*$_i$ *te laō*$_i$ *kai tois ethnesin*. In asserting that the death and resurrection of Christ and the mission to the Gentiles are the fulfilment of scripture, Luke here gives a virtual paraphrase of Lk 24:46f. What is strikingly different is the identification of the risen Lord with the church (here embodied in Paul). That this

---

[1] This application of the role of the Servant to Paul has its precedents in the Apostle's own writings. See Gal 1:15, which alludes to Is 49:1-6. Phil 2:16 (*eis kenon ekopiasa*) appears to allude to Is 49:4 (*kenos ekopiasa*). Again referring to Paul's mission, Is 52:7 is quoted at Rom 10:15, Is 53:1 at Rom 10:16, Is 52:15 at Rom 15:21, and Is 49:8 at 2 Cor 6:2. See the discussion in David M. Stanley, "The Theme if the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and Its Transformation by St. Paul," *CBQ* 16 (1954):385-425; esp. 415-18. Stanley also suggests that Paul's frequent self-designation as *doulos* may also be a reference to his own role as Servant of Yahweh.

XUM

identification is quite deliberate is indicated by Luke's application of the same imagery from Is 42 (bringing light) to Paul's mission at Acts 26:18 (anoixai ophthalmous autōn tou epistrepsai apo skotous eis phōs).[1]

The Apostles in the Role of the Prophet-Like-Moses[2]

Luke presents the disciples as acting in a way that fulfils the quotation of Dt 18:19 and Lv 23:29 at Acts 3:22f. Since Peter's speech is a call to conversion in the present time, when Jesus is no longer physically present to be heard or rejected, the text must be understood as referring to the preaching of the apostles, now acting with the full authority of the Prophet-like-Moses.[3]

---

[1] As Pokorny observes, but does not explore, the prophecy that the servant of God will be a "light to the nations" (Is 49:6; cf. 42:6), which Simeon applies to Jesus in Lk 2:30f, is fulfilled in Paul according to Acts 13:47. "Die Romfahrt des Paulus und der Antike Roman," ZNW 64 (1973):233.

[2] We didn't consider this theme under the heading of "the missions as analogous" because Luke's use of the Mosaic typology in this case stresses that the apostles act with the very authority of the Prophet-like Moses; the author is not simply using Moses as a basic of comparison, as he did with the Elijah/Elisha parallels. There it was a case of analogy: the disciples are to Jesus as Elisha was to Elijah; here it is a case of identity: both Jesus and the apostles speak and act with the authority of the Prophet-like Moses.

[3] Foakes-Jackson, in his commentary (p. 30) expresses this in a suggestive way:

> The Spirit has been manifested by words; prophecy and tongues are the signs of his presence. The

The above considerations are supported by the double meaning we found in 3:26, but the authority is dramatically illustrated in the pericope which immediately follows the second summary about community life--the fall of Ananias and Sapphira (contrasted with the good behavior of Joseph Barnabas). Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a more literal demonstration of Acts 3:23 ("everyone who does not hear that prophet shall be cut off from the people") than the comeuppance of that perverse couple.[1]

The authoritative role of the apostles is carefully articulated in these narrative vignettes. The section begins with Acts 4:34f, which describes proper

---

power of the Name of Jesus, on the other hand, is manifested in active work. Thus the first address of Peter lays emphasis on the new spirit, and the second on the proclamation of Jesus by two Apostles, Peter and John, who are able to prove by an astounding miracle that they act by his authority. Thus Jesus . . . is the New Moses, guide of his disciples on earth.

[1] Although Luke does not use the word haplotēs here, he portrays Ananias and Saphira as counter-examples of that virtue. Their eye was not haplous (see Jesus' teaching at Lk 11:34). They have indulged in the hypocrisy of the Pharisees denounced by Jesus at Luke 12:1-3, and what was covered up has been revealed. In describing their misdeed as rooted in their Satan-filled (Acts 5:3) and contriving (5:4c) hearts and their failure to deal with men as with God (5:4d), Luke uses the same complex of ideas which the house-tables of Eph 6:5f and Col 3:22 associate with haplotēs. For a full investigation of this concept, see Joseph Amstuz, HAPLOTES: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Griechisch, Theophaneia: Beitrage zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, 19 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1968).

XUM

community behavior with respect to handling private property: those who owned fields or property would, if they so chose, sell them *kai etithoun para tous podas tōn apostolōn*. Then follows the bad example of Ananias and Sapphira, who bring only a part of the proceeds *para tous podas tōn apostolōn*. The reiterated phrase *para tous podas tōn apostolōn* echoes like a refrain. The handling of material goods has become a symbol by which apostolic authority is expressed.[1] Luke further articulates the authority of the apostles by reinterpreting the synoptic tradition on the matter of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Mk 3:29 and Mk 12:32 present this saying in the context of the Beelzebul controversy, where blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is understood as ascribing to the evil spirit

---

[1] This insight I owe to Luke Johnson in private conversation.

The word about silver and gold and the Ananias and Sapphira incident should both, perhaps, be read against the background of Luke's treatment of material goods in the Third Gospel. See, for example, Lk 1:53b (". . . and the rich he has sent away empty"); 2:24 (doves, the offering of the poor); 3:10-14 (the Baptist's exhortation to share food and clothing and to be content with one's wages); 4:18 (anointed to preach the good news to the poor); 6:20b,24 ("Blessed are you poor . . . but woe to you rich ones . . . "); 6:30; 12:13-20 (words on avarice and the parable of the rich fool); 14:15-24 (possessions distract from accepting the invitation); 14:33 (the total cost of discipleship); 16:13 (God vs. Mammon); 16:14 (Pharisees termed *philargyroi*, "money-lovers"); 16:19-31 (Dives and Lazarus); 19:1-10 (Zacchaeus).

XUM

Jesus' power of exorcism. Luke, however, puts the saying in the context of the mission ommunity--Lk 12:9-12: "But whoever denies me before men, he shall be denied before the angels of God and anyone who says a word against the Son of man will be forgiven; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven. When they bring you before synagogues, governors, or rulers do not be worried how to defend yourselves or what to say, for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that hour what you are to say."[1] What follows immediately is a question from a man in the crowd regarding a quarrel over inheritance. This association of the Holy Spirit functioning in community life, and juxtaposed with material on the use of goods, prepares the way for calling the deception of the apostolic community by Ananias and Sapphira "lying to the Holy Spirit" (Acts 5:3) and "tempting the Spirit of the Lord" (5:9). It also makes it quite likely that the interpretation "Son of consolation" for the name Barnabas (4:36) is applied to Joseph as a reference to his straight dealing with the Spirit-authorized apostles.[2]

---

[1] Note that the Holy Spirit is mentioned as functioning both for judgment and for salvation.

[2] As commentators have observed--Haenchen, for example--*huios paraklēseōs* simply does not translate Barnabas, which simply seems to mean Son of Nebo or Nabu, if it has an interpretation at all. Then either Luke is repeating an error, or he finds it

XUM

This combination of factors--the literal fulfilment in persons being "cut off" from the community and the equation of deceiving the apostles with deceiving the Holy Spirit--work to illustrate the theme that the apostles are not simply *like* their master but even act in his authority, in the same Spirit, and embody the definitive power of the Prophet-like-Moses.[1]

---

significant to say that this Joseph was called son of consolation. There is good reason to suppose the latter. *Paraklēsis* in the NT (and Luke-Acts is no exception; see Acts 9:31) is intimately associated with the Holy Spirit. And if the deception of Ananias and Sapphira is called "lying to the Holy Spirit," it is fitting that one who is straightforward in his dealing with the community should be called "son-of-*paraklēsis*" by the apostles.

[1] That authority is remarkably supported by the allusive possibilities present in saying that the apostles preach and teach "in the name" [*epi tō$_i$ onomati*] of Jesus (Acts 4:17,18; 5:28,40). Although a labored distinction between *en tō$_i$ onomati* and *epi tō$_i$ onomati* and *eis ton onoma* has not proved very useful in the interpretation of Luke-Acts, there is a connection between Luke's use of *epi tō$_i$ onomati* and the LXX which is very suggestive. In Luke-Acts all the instances of *epi tō$_i$ onomati* have to do with the mission: Lk 21:8 refers to the pseudochrists who will come in Jesus' name (as if sent by Jesus?) 24:47 refers to the fulfilment of scripture in the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins in the name of the Christ; and the four remaining uses occur in the statements by or about the Sanhedrin's order that the apostles not teach or speak in the name (*epi tō$_i$ onomati*) of Jesus (Acts 4:17,18; 5:28,40). It is possible, then, that Luke uses *epi tō$_i$ onomati* when he wants to stress the mission as commissioned by Jesus. The selective use of this phrase alone suggests this. But a look at the LXX provides a cogent reason for using the phrase. It is the phrase which is used in the LXX of what is for Luke perhaps the most important passage for seeing the prophetic missions of Jesus and the church as fulfilment of scripture: Dt 18:19 "And whatever man shall not hearken to whatsoever words that prophet shall speak *in my name*,

XUM

With respect to the healing of the temple cripple, the roots of this identity of mission are illustrated in two ways: (1) in healing the man in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Peter is givine *something that he really has* (*ho de echō touto soi didōmi*, Acts 3:6); and (2) what he has is really a mediatorship of divine power ("The God of Abraham . . . has glorified his servant" 3:13). And so the healing ministry of Peter is identical with the healing work of Jesus most profoundly in that *ho theos* is the agent.[1] We saw how this was emphasized in Luke's presentation of Jesus' mission in such statements, for example, as "The power of the Lord was with him to heal" (Lk 5:17) and the summary description of Jesus "going everywhere doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, for *God was with him*" (Acts 10:38). The interpretive context of Acts 3:1-11 (especially 3:13 and

---

I will take vengeance on him." And the same rare (in the LXX) idiom is used in another important passage, at Ex 5:22f, "why have you sent (*apestalkas*) me? For from the time that I went to Pharao to speak in your name (*epi tōi sōi onomati*) he has afflicted these people." Perhaps, then, Luke uses *epi tōi onomati* in those places because he associates that phrase with the divine commission of Moses (Ex 5:22) and the Prophet-like-Moses (Dt 18).

[1] This does not exclude the agency of Jesus. Indeed the statement of Peter to Aeneas states this agency explicitly: "Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you" (9:34). But Luke cannot say everything at once. Without excluding the primacy of the work of Christ, Luke wants to say that the mission of Jesus and the church are the work of *ho theos*.

XUM

4:29f) make it clear that the primary agent of the disciples' mission is the same--ho theos.

We have seen that the immediate interpretive context (Acts 3-4), supported by themes developed in Luke-Acts as a whole, understands the healing of the temple cripple as a sign of the times ("eschatology"), as a sign of Jesus' identity and role ("christology"), and as a sign of the role of the apostolic community ("ecclesiology"). There is a fourth theme which is celebrated by our healing and its interpretive setting--salvation. The speeches of Peter make it plain that the healing of the temple cripple is both a sign and an experience of salvation. It will be the business of the final section of this chapter to explicate this theme--the soteriology, as it were, of the healing.

E. The Healing as Sign of Salvation

It is already become apparent, from earlier observations in this study,[1] that the healing of the temple cripple, a physical "saving," is by its immediate interpretive context tied to the broader theme of salvation in Luke-Acts. The cripple is "saved" (see Acts 4:9) because men of faith (3:16) have called upon the

---

[1] See especially on 4:8-12, pp. 176ff.

XUM

name of the Lord (2:21; 3:6,16; 4:10). In Peter's speech during the Council's inquest, the healed cripple stands there as if to illustrate Peter's remarks about salvation coming in the name of Jesus. It will be appropriate now to take a more systematic look at the whole of Luke-Acts to see whether these observations are consistent with Luke's characteristic use of "salvation" language.

1. *Sōzein: to heal and to save*

Perhaps more than any other New Testament writer, Luke exploits the fact that the Greek verb *sōzein* can mean 'save' or 'heal." But in doing this, he is building on a foundation laid early in the synoptic tradition in Mk 8:35: "For whoever would save [*sōsai*] his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save [*sōsei*] it." The paradox becomes meaningful only when we understand the first use of *sōzō* in the physical sense (say, avoiding martyrdom) and the second use in the eschatological sense. Luke takes over this paradoxical play on *sōzō* at 9:24.[1]

---

[1] Luke demonstrates clearly that he understands two meanings for *sōzō* here when, at L7;33, he uses two other distinct synonyms to express the same paradox: "Whoever tries to save [*peripoiēsasthai*] his life will lose it; whoever loses his life will save it [*zō$_i$ogonēsei*]." The first word has hoarding, possessive connotations; the second suggests the more vital survival of redemption.

The first instance of sōzō in the Third Gospel refers unequivocally to physical saving--in this case, healing (6:9): "Is it lawful on the sabbath . . . to save a life or to destroy it?"

But in the next use (7:50), Luke begins to exploit the rich ambiguity of the word. To the sinful woman who made up for the lax hospitality of Simon the Pharisee, Jesus said: "Your faith has saved you." Hē pistis sou sesōken se. Jesus speaks this phrase four times in the gospel of Luke. On two of these occasions, he has taken over the saying from Mark--where Jesus speaks the words to the woman healed from the hemorrhage (Lk 8:48//Mk 5:34 and Mt 9:22 [where the word precedes the cure]) and where Jesus speaks to the blind man of Jericho (Lk 18:42//Mk 10:52; omitted in Mt 20:34 but paraphrased at Mt 9:29). In both cases, sōzō quite clearly refers to physical healing. But in the other two instances of this phrase in Luke, the same words clearly refer to a "saving" that is other than physical--7:50, spoken to the sinful woman, and 17:19, spoken to the Samaritan leper. In the case of the woman, sōzō refers to forgiveness; in the case of the grateful Samaritan, sōzō must refer to something other than the cleansing, since all ten were made clean. (Is it the relationship with Jesus, which he enters by thanking him and giving glory to God?) However sōzō

XUM

is to be interpreted in the cases of the woman and the leper, it can be clearly seen from Luke's fourfold use of the phrase hē pistis sou sesōken se--twice meaning physical cure and twice pointing beyond the physical--that our author is aware of, and is consciously exploiting the rich ambiguity of sōzein.

2. The Taunts under the Cross

Although Luke lacks the taunt about destroying the temple which is found in Mark (15:29) and Matthew (27:39), he does have three taunts about Jesus saving himself, two of which are unique to the Third Gospel. First (here paralleling Mk 15:31 and Mt 27:42), there is the mockery of the rulers: "He saved others, let him save himself if he is ho Christos tou theou ho eklektos (Lk 23:35).[1] Then the soldiers mock him: "If you are the king of the Jews, sōson seauton" (23:37). Finally, one of the criminals says, "Are you not ho Christos; sōson seauton kai hēmas" (23:39). Luke has in this way emphasized the ironic logic--if you are the expected Messiah, perform the expected physical rescue.[2]

---

[1] Here we have the peculiarly Lucan title, "the Christ of God"--the title placed in Peter's mouth at Lk 9:20.

[2] Van Unnik suggests, regarding Lk 13:23, that hoi sōzomenoi may be a technical term in Jewish eschatological speculation. The context here (as also in Mt 7:13f) is eschatological and the Gk phrase is used in the LXX of Is 37:32, where it translates פְּלֵיטָה

In underscoring their false conception of both Christos and sōzein, Luke has set the reader up for the contrasting understanding of the other thief: Iēsou, mnēstheti mou hotan elthēs eis tēn basileian sou.[1]

3. Before the Council

Perhaps the most striking example of alternation between the physical and eschatological meanings of sōzō occurs in Peter's words before the Sanhedrin on the occasion of their investigation into the healing.

("band of survivors"--RSV), a term in synonymous parallelism with שארים ("remnant"--RSV). Van Unnik, "L'usage de sōzein, 'sauver,' et ses derives dans les evangiles synoptiques," in La Formation des evangiles (Recherches Bibliques, 2: 1957), p. 191. A point overlooked by Van Unnik: the use of hoi sōzomenoi in Acts 2:47 may be a conscious Christian, or Lucan, appropriation of that term--i.e., the Christian believers, those who have called upon the name of the Lord, are that "band of survivors." See also p.   above.

[1] As Navone puts it: "The good Thief's words, 'When you enter into your kingdom,' have an authentically messianic significance that is recognized in the promise of Paradise which Jesus makes to him. Luke contrasts the purely temporal interpretation of the messianic kingdom, which characterizes those who tell Jesus to save himself, with the genuinely spiritual interpretation of the man who, despite the apparent hopelessness of the situation, asks to be remembered (i.e., saved)." Themes of St. Luke (Rome: Gregorian University Press, n.d.), p. 147f. Navone alludes here to Brevard Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel (London: 1962), 35;41, where it is asserted that divine remembering is one way in which salvation is traditionally expressed in the prayers of Israel.

[We quote the text for 23:42--eis tēn basileian--the variant of p^{75} B L, which we read along with the Metzger committee as more consonant with Lucan theology.]

Peter begins, "Leaders of the people and elders, if we are being questioned today about the good deed done to the lame man and how he was made well (*sesō$_i$stai*) . . ." and goes on to say that it was in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth; he adds that in no one else is there *sōtēria*.[1] He ends this little speech with the assertion that "there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved (*dei sōthēnai hēmas*." Clearly, in this last instance of *sōzō*, eschatological saving is meant. The physical healing of the man born lame has not been left behind. Indeed he remains in the midst of the narrative up to the last verse of the pericope (4:22; cf. 4:9,10,14,16,21). But in the four-verse speech of Peter, Luke has, by playing the full range of the salvation words, made this physical healing a sign of the ultimate messianic blessing.

4. *Sōtēria*

Since the noun *sōtēria* figures so prominently in the key pssage just discussed, it will be instructive to reflect on that word as it is used elsewhere in Luke-Acts. It turns up 4x in Lk; 6x in Acts; and,

---

[1] The context, the citation of Ps 117:22, and the eschatological use of the word elsewhere in Luke-Acts (Lk 1:77; 19:9; Acts 13:26,47) suggest that more than physical healing is referred to here.

XUM

elsewhere in the gospels, only at Jn 4:22. Three of the four uses in the Third Gospel occur in the canticle of Zechariah (the Benedictus) and the transmutation of the word in that brief context is striking. First, at Lk 1:69, the word is used in language that connotes military victory; the phrase keras sōtērias is used in the LXX as the name by which David praises God in a hymn of thanksgiving in Ps 17:3 LXX.[1] That this horn of salvation is raised in the "house of David" provides a Davidic context which reinforces the political connotation of the word. (In the context of the Third Gospel, of course, the Davidic appellation is applied to Jesus; the point is that it is this OT notion which is being applied.) Verse 71, in a parallel elaboration, specifies the salvation as sōtērian ex echthrōn hēmōn kai ek cheiros pantōn tōn misountōn hēmas; up to this point and, indeed, clear through the next four verses, the canticle sounds like a thanksgiving for military victory. But with the apostrophe to the new-born John, vv. 76ff, a new note is sounded: the prophet's mission is "to give knowledge of salvation [gnōsin sōtērias] to his people in the forgiveness of their sins." Salvation from enemies has become salvation from one's sins; and the verses which follow would seem to be an elaboration of that kind of salvation. It is salvation in a new key. The Benedictus proclaims that the God who saved us militarily through the likes of David will show his fidelity in the most radical deliverance of all, salvation from our own sins; and this will be what it means to be led from the shadow of death into the way of peace. This transmutation of sōteria (from the political to the spiritual) may well be Luke's way of countering an overly political notion of Jesus' messiahship. The fourth use of sōtēria in the gospel of Luke occurs in Lk 19:9: "Today sōtēria has happened in this house, since this man too is a son of Abraham." Here, as in the Benedictus, the Abrahamic promise of salvation is interpreted as conversion. And, if we are in doubt about the nature of this salvation, the next verse clarifies what is meant: "For the Son of man has come to seek and save [sōsai] the lost [to apolōlos]." Both the diction and the narrative recall chapter 15 of the gospel. There also bystanders murmur against Jesus' sharing hospitality with sinners[1] and Jesus tells the three parables of the lost things--the sheep, the coin, and the son. The perfect participle of apollymi,

---

[1] Lest there be any doubt about the military context, see the context where this psalm occurs in 2 Kgd 22; it follows upon his victories over the Philistines.

---

[1] Diagongyzō, strikingly, occurs only at Lk 15:2 and 19:7 in the NT. The word also evokes the murmuring against Moses during the wilderness period.

XUM

apolōlos, also occurs in Luke-Acts only in these two passages (Lk 19:10; 15:4,6,24,32). In the context of the Third Gospel, then, Lk 19:10 ("The Son of man has come to seek and save the lost") interprets the action of Jesus with Zacchaeus as it reflects those parables of God's loving reception of the sinner. In this case sōzō means "save" in the sense of to forgive.

5. Sōtēr

In this survey of salvation language, it should be noted that sōtēr is used four times in Luke-Acts. It is used once of God (Lk 1:47: "My spirit rejoices in God tō$_i$ sōtēri mou") and three times of Jesus: in the angelic chorus (2:11 etechthē hymin sēmeron sōtēr), the speech of Peter at Acts 5:31 ("God exalted him at his right hand as Leader [archēgon] and Savior [sōtēra], to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins"), and Paul's speech at 13:23 ("Of this man's [David's] posterity God has brought forth a Savior [sōtēra], Jesus, as he promised."). This is not the place for an extended discussion of the title sōtēr[1] but it should be noticed that even the spare usage of the title in Acts mirrors something of the range of the cognate noun, sōtēria. On the one hand, the Davidic context of 13:23

---

[1] See, for example, O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. S. Guthrie and C. Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 238-46.

and the analogue to 5:31 provided by the epithets for Moses at 7:35 (archonta kai lytrōtēn)[1] supply a political model for understanding sōtēr (as in the first two uses of sōtēria in the Benedictus). On the other hand, 5:31 specifies clearly that, while political rescue may be the image, the work of this Savior is metanoia and forgiveness of sins (as in the third use of sōtēria in the Benedictus).

6. Five Confirming Examples

Sōzein is used five times in a 51-verse stretch of Luke in ways that have important implications regarding his association of healing with messianic salvation--especially since four of these five instances are peculiar to (and possibly redactional in) Luke. (1) Jesus' word to the sinful woman, "Your faith has saved you" (7:50). We have already observed that sōzō appears to refer to forgiveness here. (2) In his version of the interpretation of the parable of the sower, Luke adds to the Marcan comment about the devil snatching up the word the purpose clause hina mē pisteusantes sōthōsin ("Lest they believe and be saved" 8:12). Here Luke intensifies mission language already present in the Marcan interpretation, and the saving in question is eschatological salvation. (3) Where the Marcan narrative about the Gerasene demoniac speaks of the witnesses telling "what had happened to the demoniac" (Mk 5:15), Luke's version speaks of their telling pōs esōthē ho daimonistheis ("How he who had been possessed with demons had been healed" 8:36). Here sōzō refers to the observable physical transformation of the man. (4) "Your faith has saved you" (Lk 8:48). This time it is spoken to the woman who had suffered from hemorrhage; Luke has retained it from Mark and, obviously, it refers to her being healed from the flow of blood. (5) Whereas Mark, at 5:23, has Jairus use the word sōzein in the sense of 'heal,' 'to save the sick person from a desperate situation,' Luke, by having Jesus say after the announcement of death, "Only believe and she shall be saved," (8:50) places sōzein in antithesis to dying, in the sense of 'to make alive.'[1]

---

[1] J. Dupont, Études, p. 149, notes that Wilckens overlooks Acts 7:35 in this connection and finds that that verse suggests that archēgos and sōtēr at 5:31 parallel Jesus with Moses.

In these five instances of sōzein, we have an interesting glimpse of Luke the author at work. After using the words to denote forgiveness (7;50; peculiar to Luke) and eschatological salvation (8:12; Lucan redaction), he then employs it in regard to deliverance from the demonic (8:36; Lucan redaction), stopping a hemorrhage (8:48), and working a resuscitation (8:50; Lucan redaction). If he had wanted to avoid ambiguity of language, other words were surely available--e.g., therapeuō, iaomai. But instead, he rather deliberately employs sōzein to both spiritual and physical kinds of "salvation," even adding the word where Mark is content to do without it (Lk 8:12,36,50). This cultivated ambiguity suggests that Luke readily associates physical and spiritual deliverance and may even see one as a sign of the other. The healing of the paralytic, already in the Marcan version of the synoptic tradition (Mk 2:1-12), provides the outstanding narrative precedent for this association. But the healing of the temple beggar (Acts 3:1-11), especially as interpreted by Peter's speech at the inquest (Acts 4:8-12), provides the most explicit association of physical and spiritual salvation. The full context of Acts 3-4 clearly presents this healing as a sign demonstrating the nature of eschatological salvation: it releases the immobile, offers a power greater than money, and frees persons to come together in joyful and worshipful unity in the presence of God.

---

[1] This last observation derives from Van Unnik, "L'usage," p. 156.

XUM

CONCLUSION

A. Acts 3:1-10 and the Healing Accounts of the Third Gospel

At the end of chapter one, we itemized under seven headings what we learned about the evangelist's method and thematic concerns. Our study of Acts 3:1-4:31 has revealed that all seven of those characteristics are evident in Luke's orchestration of the healing of the temple beggar:

1. He develops the theme of liberation. The healing is a sign among the 'signs and wonders' of a new exodus wrought under the authority of Jesus, the promised Prophet-like-Moses, the *archēgos tēs zōēs*, who brings national liberation to a new level--release from the individual's own wickedness.
2. He elaborates the theme of restoration. In narrating the healing of the temple cripple, Luke emphasizes the transformation from lameness to leaping and the progression from impotent exclusion to jubilant participation in worship. Moreover, this healing is presented as a sign of the "restoration of all," promised by all of the prophets and beginning to unfold in the 'today' of Jesus and the church.

3. He uses words whose *Septuagintal connotations* are especially suggestive--e.g., *hallomai* (Acts 3:8; cf. Is 35:6), *exallomai* (Acts 3:8; cf. Mic 2:12; Is 55:12), *holoklēria* (Acts 3:16; cf. Is 1:6 l.v.) *apokatastasis*--by way of its verbal cognate *apokathistēmi* -- (3:21; cf. Jer 5:18f; 16:15; 23:8; 24:6; 27:19; Ez 17:23; Mal 3:22f), *euergesia* (Acts 4:9; cf. Ps 77:11; Wis 16:10ff), *sēmeion/sēmeia kai terata* (Acts 4:16,22 [*sēmeion*] and 4:30 [*sēmeia kai terata*]; cf. LXX *passim* for God's wonders in the days of Moses).[1]

4. He employs diction (some of it Septuagintal) which has *thematic resonances with other parts of Luke-Acts*--e.g., *hallomai* (Acts 3:8; cf. 14:10); *euergesia* (Acts 4:9; cf. *euergetēs* at Lk 22:25 and *euergeteō* at Acts 10:38), *onoma* (Acts 3:6,16; 4:7,9,10, 12, 17, 30; cf. Acts 2:21 (Jl 3:5),38; 5:28,40,41; 8:12,16; 19:14,15,16,21; etc.), *sōtēria* (Acts 4:12; cf. Lk 1:69,71,77; 19:9; Acts 7:25; 13:26,47; 16:17; 27:34), *sēmeia kai terata* (Acts 4:16,22 [*sēmeion*],

---

[1] See also *eleēmosynē* (Acts 3:2,3,10 'alms'; cf. Ps 23:5; 32:5; 102:6; Is 28:17; 38:18; 59:16--'mercy'), *argyrion kai chrysion* (Acts 3:6; cf. Ex 20:23; Ps 113:12ff; 134:15), *pais* (3:13,26; 4:27,30; cf. Is 52:13 and *passim* to designate prophet), *anapsyxis* (3:20; cf. Is 32:15 Sym), and *tessarakonta* (Acts 4:22; cf. LXX *passim*, to allude to desert period.

30; cf. 2:19,22,43; 5:12; 6:8; 7:36; 14:3; 15:12), and *parrēsia* (Acts 4:13,29,31; cf. Acts 2:29; 28:31).[1]

5. Luke emphasizes the *complementarity of word and deed*. The word of Peter's speeches explains the deed of healing. The *parrēsia* of Peter (and John) is every bit as much a cause of wonder as the healing (4:13). The community prayer asks for boldness in preaching accompanied by 'signs and wonders' of healing.
6. Luke stresses that the actions of Jesus and the church are *the work of God*. See Acts 3:12f (". . . why do you stare at us . . . ? The God of Abraham . . . has glorified his servant Jesus") and Acts 3:18 ("But what God foretold . . . he thus fulfilled"). The whole speech in Solomon's Portico puts everything in terms of God's action: He spoke by the prophets, has raised up a prophet like Moses, gave a covenant to the fathers, etc. And the community prayer, addressed to God as *Despotēs* and

---

[1] Note as well *hōra* (Acts 3:1; cf. 2:15; 5:7; 10:3,9,30), *prosdokaō* (Acts 3:5; Lk 3:15; cf. 7:19f; 12:46; 10:24; 27:33), *atenizō* (Acts 3:4,12; cf. Lk 4:20; 22:56; Acts 14:9), *aineō* (Acts 3:8; cf. Lk 2:13, 20; 19:37; Acts 2:47), *dynamis* (Acts 4:7; cf. Lk 1:35; 4:14,36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 4:33; 10:38), *archontes* (Acts 3:17, 4:5,8,26; cf. Lk 23:13, 35; Acts 13:27; 14:5; 16:19), *sēmeron* (Acts 4:9; cf. Lk 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32; 19:9; 23:43), *sōzō* (Acts 4:9,12; cf. Lk. *passim*; Acts 2:21,40,47; 11:14; 14:9; 15:1,11; 16:30,31; 27:30,31), *tessarakonta* (Acts 4:22; 7:36; 7:42; 13:18).

creator of all, asks that he continue his action by giving parrēsia in preaching and by extending his hand in healing (Acts 4:29f).

7. Luke has incorporated this healing in an editorial 'package.' What we found to be true in the Lucan treatment of the Capernaum 'day,' in the chiasmus surrounding the bent women, and in the larger rhythm of choral responses--namely an editorial arrangement serving eschatological and christological themes--turns out to be true also of the editorial unity we have found in Acts 3:1-4:31.

B. The Healing as Symbol

Can we conclude that the account of the temple cripple's cure is in any sense symbolic?

The most obvious clue that Luke intends the healing to point beyond itself is the play on sōzein in Acts 4:9,12. The thought moves from the physical 'saving' of the lame man (v. 9) to the total 'saving' in the name of Jesus meant for all mankind (v. 12)--a transition of thought which is meaningless unless the first saving is meant to be a sign of the second.

Further examination of the text and context found that the healing pointed beyond itself in several carefully thematized ways. It is presented as a sign among the 'signs and wonders' of a new exodus, a sign

XUM

that the end-time has begun, a sign of the power of the Prophet-like-Moses definitively 'raised up' (the resurrection understood as the fulness of his prophetic mission), and a sign demonstrating the authority of the apostolic mission.

Whether the temple cripple is an image of Israel--first powerless and cut off from its heritage, then restored--cannot, perhaps, be rigidly demonstrated. We submit, however, that such an hypothesis integrates a number of factors within the text and its context.

1. The Septuagint's use of hallomai (Is 35:6), exallomai (Mic 2:12; Is 55:12), and holoklēria (Is 1:6 l.v.) put us in contact with prophetic images of Israel fallen and Israel restored.
2. Luke portrays worship as Israel's vocation and heritage (see Lk 1:75 and Acts 7:7), and in Stephen's speech he charges her with having largely failed in that vocation. This may be the reason for the emphasis the narrative gives to the place of worship, the temple (Acts 3:1,2[2x],3,8,10)--with the lame man at first powerless and excluded, and then included and praising, that is, Israel lost and found.
3. Once this symbolic perspective has been opened, eleēmosynē takes on a new valence. The beggar asks for 'alms,' the meaning of eleēmosynē on the immediate level of the narrative (Acts 3:2,3,10). What

in fact he receives is 'mercy,' the usual meaning of eleēmosynē in the Septuagint (see LXX Ps 23:5; 32:5; 102:6; Is 28:17; 38:18). Thus, the beggar embodies the situation of Israel as Luke portrays it in these chapters; powerless in its sins, it is in the presence of God's mercy offered in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

4. Three times in Acts Luke refers to the 'forty years' of Israel's time of rebellion, in the desert (7:36, 42; 13:18). In the midst of exodus allusions to God working signs and wonders through his New Moses, the note that the man was "more than forty years old" (4:22) may be another clue to Luke's intending him as an emblem of Israel finally, tardily, coming into her promised blessing.
5. In this context the idolatrous connotations of "silver and gold" (Acts 3:6; cf. Ex 20:23; Ps 113:12ff; 134:15) may allude to Israel's infidelity during the desert period.
6. The healing can be understood as the third in a series of presentations of the restoration of Israel--the first two being the restoration of the Twelve (Acts 1:15-26)[1] and the Pentecostal gathering of Jews from all nations (Acts 2:5ff).[2]

---

[1] See p. 172, n. 1.

[2] The healing, together with the speech which it prompts, becomes the occasion of a massive numerical

7. If the temple beggar can be understood as an image of Israel, then his healing 'acts out' the goal and content of Peter's speech in Solomon's Portico. Addressed to the people as Andres Israēlitai (Acts 3:12), the speech invites the listeners to claim their heritage as sons of Abraham and of all the prophets by hearing the promised Prophet-like-Moses and thereby receiving the blessing of release from sins. In this response, and its consequence, the "restoration of all" proclaimed by all the prophets, begins to be fulfilled. It is this end-time restoration of the people (rather than some cosmic restoration, such as Origen envisioned) which would seem to be the referent in the phrase, apokatastasis pantōn.

C. Some Final Observations

Symbol versus history?

This study suggests that the disjunction, symbol *or* history, is a false one. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Luke has accepted as genuine a tradition about the healing activity of the early church and has used it precisely because of its symbolic value as a tool for interpreting the history of that early community. Whether or not a healing of a temple beggar was the first healing of Peter's ministry,

---

increase in the Jerusalem community--from 3000 (Acts 2:41) to 5000 (4:4).

XUM

Luke finds it to be the most significant healing for interpreting the history of the church's beginnings. In this way, symbol is not a substitute for history; rather, it serves it.

Luke-Acts as a Two-Volume Whole

This study lends support to the theory of the unified authorship of Luke-Acts. A coherent vision informs the transmission of the tradition. And, while it may still be heuristically useful to seek evidence of a distinction between tradition and redaction in Acts (the basis of much of Haenchen's stimulating contribution), it is still fruitful to work on the assumption that the author of Luke-Acts is in full control of his material and transmits no tradition unassimilated.

Luke's End-Time Perspective

Our investigation of the eschatological significance of 'this sign of healing' suggests that much of the discussion regarding Luke's eschatology has been misplaced. *Pace* such scholars as Conzelmann and, more recently, Wilson, it is not primarily a question of When comes the End (late or soon?). Rather, with such as Flender, W. Robinson, and F. Danker, we find that Luke is interested in showing the time of the church to be in continuity with the time of Jesus and that, in both ministries, the end-time expectations of Israel have already begun to be fulfilled.[1]

Some Pastoral Implications

To take Luke-Acts seriously as normative for the church today is to read the story of the church as living out the story of Jesus, to believe that the Father is exercising his saving and freeing Reign in the church today as in the 'today' of Jesus' earthly ministry, and to understand that the ministries of preaching and healing are interconnected.

Reports of extramedical cures abound today. According to the mind-set of the beholder or auditor, these phenomena are interpreted variously as hysterical, illusory, psychic, or charismatic. At such a moment we have an important lesson to learn from Luke. For he never treats a healing--whether by Jesus or by the church--in curious isolation. Like the other evangelists, Luke always considers healing in the context of the work of God, freeing his people through the Spirit of his reigning Son. For the author of Luke-Acts, cures are significant only insofar as they illuminate and promote that new exodus.

---

[1] S. Wilson asserts that Luke's eschatology is not the same in the Gospel and Acts. "In the Gospel there is a tension between imminent expectation and allowance which is made of a delay in the Parousia; in Acts there is no imminent expectation." The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts, p. 86.

This would be a fair enough assessment if Luke's eschatology were informed by a preoccupation with the time of the parousia. But our study suggests that Luke is not so much interested in the parousia as in illustrating how God's action through Jesus and the church is itself the inauguration of the end-time. Within this understanding, Luke has indeed used gospel traditions in such a way as to strike a balance between those which stress the delay of the parousia and those which stress its imminence (a point which W. demonstrates well). But these issues are subordinated to the larger question of the eschatological meaning of the time of Jesus and his church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts and Tools

Aland, Kurt. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et Patrum adhibitis edita. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and revision of the ninth-tenth German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by R. W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Braude, William G. (trans.). Pesikta Rabbiti: Discourses for Feasts, Fasts, and Special Sabbaths. Yale Judaica Series, vol. 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Danby, H., ed. The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes. Oxford: University Press, 1933.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971. 2nd ed., revised.

Ginzberg, Louis. The Legends of the Jews. Trans. by Henrietta Szold, 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-38.

Hatch, E., and Redpath, H. A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Austria: Akademische Druck- u.Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Josephus Flavius. Complete Works, trans. by L. Whiston. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel, 1960.

XUM

Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich, Gerhard, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 9 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964-74.

Liddell, H. G., and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-40.

Lohse, Eduard, ed. *Die Texte aus Qumran*. Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1971.

Mattill, A. J., Jr., and Mattill, M. B. *A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Tools and Studies, no. 7. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 4th ed. revised, 1963. Reprinted, 1967.

Nestle, Eberhard, Nestle, Erwin, and Aland, Kurt, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 25th ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1969.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: id est vetus testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Wurtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1905. 8th edition.

Stenning, J. F., ed. and trans. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 6 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922-61.

Vermes, G., trans. and ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.

Zerwick, Maximilian, S. J. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples*. English edition adapted from the fourth Latin edition by Joseph Smith, S. J. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Isaias*. Vol. 14: of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.

XUM

B. Commentaries on Luke

Caird, George B. *The Gospel of St. Luke*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Harmondsworth, 1963. New York: Seabury, 1968.

Creed, John Martin. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.

Danker, Frederick W. *Jesus and the New Age according to St. Luke: A Commentary on the Third Gospel*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1972.

Easton, Barton Scott. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. New York: Scribner's, 1926.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp (eds.). *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*, 5 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1920-33. Vol. 4, *English Translation and Commentary*, ed. by Kirsopp Lake and H. J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan & Co., 1933; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1965. Vol. 5, *Additional Notes to the Commentary*, ed. by Lake and Cadbury. London: Macmillan & Co., 1933; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1966.

Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament III, zweite Auflage. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

Loisy, Alfred. *L'évangile selon Luc*. Paris: 1924; reprint ed., Frankfurt: Minerva GmbH., 1971.

Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinem Quellen erlkärt*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.

Schmid, Joseph. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960.

XUM

Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium. Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll, C. P. "The Gospel according to St. Luke." *Jerome Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Raymond E. Brown, S. S., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J., and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968, 2:116-54.

C. Commentaries on Acts

Bauernfeind, O. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, no. 5. Leipzig, 1939.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Tyndale Press, 1951; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1970.

Bard, B. T. *Apostelgeschichte*. Erzhausen: Leuchter-Verlag GmbH., 1966.

Boor, Werner de. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1965.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972.

Dillon, Richard J., and Fitzmyer, Joseph. "Acts of the Apostles." In Raymond E. Brown, S.S., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J., and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm (eds.). *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968; 2:165-214.

Dupont, Jacques. *Les Actes des Apôtres*. La sainte Bible [de Jerusalem](fascicle edition; Paris, 1954.)

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1931.

Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Trans. B. Noble et al. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.

XUM

Harnack, A. Die Apostelgeschichte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinricks, 1908.

Knox, Ronald. The Acts of the Apostles and Paul's Letters to the Churches. A New Testament Commentary for English Readers, vol. 2. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Acts" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, eds. Revised ed; London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1962.

Loisy, Alfred. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920.

Macgregor, G. "The Acts of the Apostles." The Interpreter's Bible, 9. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Moulton, Harold K. The Acts of the Apostle. Mysore City, India: Wesley Press, 1957.

Preuschen, D. Erwin. Die Apostelgeschichte Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1912.

Rendall, Frederick. The Acts of the Apostles in Greek and English, with Notes. London: Macmillan and Co., 1897.

Robinson, Hastings. The Acts of the Apostles. London: John W. Parker, 1839.

Smith, Robert H. Acts. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970.

Stahlin, Gustav. Die Apostelgeschichte. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, 5. 10th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Weiss, Bernhard. Die Apostelgeschichte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893.

Wellhausen, Julius. Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte. Berlin: Weidmarnische Buchhandlung, 1914.

Wendt, Hans Heinrich. Die Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. Die Apostelgeschichte. Regensburg: Pustet, 1961.

D. Studies

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Gospel Miracle Tradition and the Divine Man." *Interpretation* 26 (1974):174-197.

________. "The Origin and Function of the Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972):198-221.

________. "Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970):265-91.

Amstutz, Joseph. *HAPLOTĒS: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Griechisch*. Theophaneia: Beitrage zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums, 19. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1968.

Baltzer, K. "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings." *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965):263-77.

Barrett, C. K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1947.

________. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

Bauernfeind, O. "Tradition und Komposition in dem Apokatastasisspruch Apostelgeschichte 3,20f." In O. Betz (ed.), *Abraham Unser Vater*. Fest-Schrift fur Otto Michel. Leiden/Cologne: Brill, 1963.

Betz, H. D. "The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Lk 17: 11-19)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 1971):314-28.

________. "Jesus as Divine Man." In T. F. Trotter, ed. *Jesus and the Historian*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968. Pp. 114-33.

Betz, Otto. "The Kerygma of Luke." *Interpretation* 22 (1968):131-46.

________. *Was Wissen Wir von Jesus?* Berlin: Kreuz-Verlag, 1965.

XUM

Bietenhard, Hans. "onoma." In G. Friedrich, ed. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 5:242-282.

Bovon, F. "Le salut dans les ecrits de Luc. Essai." Revue de theologie et de philosophie 23 (1974): 296-307.

Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-68):96-111.

Bruce, F. F. The Speeches in Acts. London: The Tyndale Press, 1942.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by J. Marsh. Revised edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Cadbury, H. "Acts and Eschatology" in W. D. Davies. The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.

________. The Book of Acts in History. London: 1955.

________. The Making of Luke-Acts. New York: Macmillan, 1927; reprint ed., London: SPCK, 1961.

Cerfaux, Lucien. "La première communauté chretienne à Jerusalem." Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses 16 (1939):5-31.

Conzelmann, Hans. "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 217-230. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

________. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Coppens, Joseph. L'imposition des mains et les rites connexes dans le Nouveau Testament et dans l'église ancienne. Paris: Gabalda, 1925.

Corbett, S. "Some Observations on the Gateways to the Herodian Temple in Jerusalem." Palestine Exploration Quarterly 84 (1952):7-15.

Daniélou, Jean. L'église des apôtres. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970.

Dahl, Nils. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." In L. Keck and L. Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966. Pp. 139-58.

Danker, Frederick W. "Hardness of Heart: A Study in Biblical Thematic." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 44 (1973):89-100.

Davies, W. D., and Daube, D., eds. *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*. Essays in honor of C. H. Dodd. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

Degenhardt, Hans-Joachim. *Lukas: Evangelist der Armen*. Stuttgart: Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk Stuttgart, 1965.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Figtrees in the New Testament." *The Heythrop Journal* 14 (1973):249-65.

________. "The Manger: Ritual Law and Soteriology." *Theology* 74 (1971):566-71.

Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by H. Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling. New York: Scribner's, 1956.

Dodd, C. H. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. New York: Harper, 1936.

Dubois, Jean-Daniel. "La figure d'Élie dans la perspective lucannienne." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 53 (1973):155-76.

Dupont, J. "Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le Chapitre XXIV de l'évangile de Luc," in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc: Problèmes litteraires et theologique*. [Cerfaux Festschrift] Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Louvaniensum Belgium: Editorio J. Duculot, S. A., Gemboux, 1973. Pp. 329-374.

________. *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Lectio Divina, 45. Paris: Cerf, 1967.

________. *The Sources of the Acts*. Trans. K. Pond. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 3. Cambridge: The University Press, 1966.

Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In D. E. Nineham, ed. *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957. Pp. 37-53.

________. "The Kerygma." *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1956):25-41.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S. J. "4Q Testimonia and the New Testament." *Theological Studies* 18 (1957): 513-37.

________. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls" in Keck and Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), 233-57.

________. "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke." *Perspective* 11 (1970):131-70.

________. "Some Observations on the *Genesis Apocryphon*." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 22 (1960): 277-91.

Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologican of Redemptive History*. Translated by Reginald H. and Ilsa Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Flusser, D. "Healing through Laying on of Hands in a DSS." *Israel Exploration Journal* 7 (1957): 107-108.

Fuller, Reginald H. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

________. *Interpreting the Miracles*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Goulder, M. D. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK, 1964.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *Mission in the New Testament*. Translated by F. Clarke. Naperville: A. R. Allenson, 1963.

________. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. New York: World Publishing Co., 1969.

Harnack, Adolph. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das neue Testament von Adolph Harnack, 3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908.

Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *"Im Namen Jesu." Eine sprach- u. religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.

Hempel, Johannes. *Heilung als Symbol und Wirklichkeit im biblische Schrifttum*. Nachrichten von der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1,3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958.

Held, Heinz J. "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories." In Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and J. Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. by Percy Scott. London: SCM Press, 1963. Pp. 165-299.

Hobart, William K. *The Medical Language of St. Luke*. Dublin: Hodges, Friggis and Co., 1882; reprint ed., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1954.

Hull, John M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, 28. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1974.

Isaksson, Abel. *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple*. Lund: Cleerup, 1965.

Jaggi, Paul. *Was ich aber habe, das gebe ich dir; eine Deutung der Heilung des Lahmen vor der schöne Tempelpforte nach Apostelgeschichte 3 und 4*. Bern: Christliches Verlagshaus, 1953.

Jeremias, Joachim. "*Hēl(e)ias*." In G. Kittel, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 2:928-41.

________. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

________. *The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Scribner's, 1963.

Jervell, Jacob. "Das gespaltene Israel und die Heidenvölker. Zur Motivierung der Heidenmission in der Apostelgeschichte." *Studia Thelogica* 19 (1965):68-96.

________. *Luke and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.

Jülicher, Adolph. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963; a reprint of the Tübingen 1910 ed.; orig. pub.: 1888-89.

Keck, Leander. *Mandate to Witness: Studies in the Book of Acts*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1972.

________. "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965):341-58.

________, and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Kee, Howard C. "Aretalogy and Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92.3 (1973):402-422.

Kertelge, Karl. *Die Wunder Jesu im Markus-Evangelium*. Munich: Kosel Verlag, 1970.

Kilgallen, John, S.J. *A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2-53*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1974.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1969.

Kränkl, Emmeram. *Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesu in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte*. Biblische Untersuchungen 8. Regensburg: Pustet, 1972.

XUM

Kremer, Jacob. *Pfingstbericht und Pfingstgeschehen: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Apg 2,1-13.* Stuttgart: KBV Verlag, 1973.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles." In C. F. D. Moule (ed.), *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History.* London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1965. Pp. 165-178.

Lane, William L. "Times of Refreshment. A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity." Ph. D. Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1962.

Leaney, A. R. C. "I Peter and the Passover: An Interpretation." *New Testament Studies* 10(1964): 238-51.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetics: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Lövestam, E. *Son and Saviour*. Coniectanea Neotestamentica 18 (1961) Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1961.

Lohfink, Gerhard. "Christologie und Geschichtesbild in Apg 3,19-21." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 13 (1969):223-41.

________. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchung zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhohungstexten bei Lukas.* Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 26. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1971.

________. *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie.* Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 39. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1975.

Loos, H. van der. *The Miracles of Jesus.* Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 9. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

McCasland, S. Vernon. *By the Finger of God: Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light of Modern Views of Mental Illness.* New York: Macmillan, 1951.

________. "Religious Healing in First-Century Palestine." In J. T. McNeill, Spinka, and Willoughby, eds. *Environmental Factors in Christian History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. 18-34.

McGinley, Laurence J., S.J. *Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives: A Study in the Theories of Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann*. Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944.

McKelvey, F. J. "Christ the Cornerstone." *New Testament Studies* 8 (1901-2):352-9.

März, Claus-Peter. *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die Lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung*. Erfurter Theologische Schriften 11. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1974.

Maisch, Ingrid. *Die Heilung des Gelähmten*. Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mk 2,1-12. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 52. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1971.

Mánek, Jindrich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1957/58);8-23.

Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Toronto: Home Evangel Books, Ltd., Paternoster Press, 1970.

Méhat, A. "'Apocatastase,' Origène, Clémont d'Alexandre, Act. 3,21." *Vigiliae Christianae* 10 (1956): 196-214.

Miller, Marvin Henry. "The Character of Miracles in Luke-Acts." Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, California, 1971.

Miyoshi, Michi. *Der Anfang des Reiseberichts: Lk 9, 51-10,24*. Analecta biblica 60. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.

Moule, C. F. D. (ed.). *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*. London: Mowbray, 1965.

XUM

Mussner, Franz. "Die Idee der *Apokatastasis* in der Apostelgeschichte." In *Lex tua veritas*, pp. 293-306. Edited by Heinrich Gross and Franz Mussner. Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1961.

Navone, John. *Themes of St. Luke*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, n.d.

New, Silva. "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands." *Beginnings* 5:121-40.

Neirynck, F. *L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes litteraires et théologiques*. [Cerfaux Festschrift] Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Louvaniensum. Belgium: Editorio J. Duculot, S. A., Gemboux, 1973.

Nock, A. D. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

________. "Soter and Euergetes." In Clifton G. Johnson, ed. *The Joy of Study*, F. C. Grant Fest. New York: Macmillan, 1951. Pp. 127-48.

Oepke, Albrecht. "*apokathistemi, apokatastasis*." In G. Kittel, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 1:387-93.

Paul, André. "La guérison d'un lepreux." *Nouvelle revue théologique* 92(1970):592-604.

________. "La guérison de l'aveugle (des aveugles) de Jericho." *Foi et vie: cahiers biblique 9* (1970):44-69.

Perels, O. *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihren Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 4 Folge; 12 Heft. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934.

Perrin, Norman. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus.* New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Plümacher, Eckhard. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Studien zur Umwelt des NT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Pokorny, Petr. "Die Romfahrt des Paulus und der Antike Roman." *Zeitschrift fur die neuestestamentliche Wissenschaft* 64 (1973);233-44.

Rengstorf, C. H. "*sēmeion ktl.*" In G. Friedrich, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 7*:200-261.

Reploh, Karl-Georg. *Markus: Lehrer der Gemeinde: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Jüngerperikopen des Markus-Evangeliums.* Stuttgart: Verlag Katholische Bibelwerk, 1969.

Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas.* Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universitat.

Richardson, Alan. *The Miracle Stories of the Gospel.* New York: Harper, 1941.

Robinson, J. A. T. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1956): 177-89.

Robinson, W. C. *The Way of the Lord.* University of Basle dissertation, 1969.

Robinson, W. C., Jr. "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative (9:51ff.)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960):20-31.

Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton from the German *Die redactionsgeschichtliche Methode* (Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1966).

Sabourin, Leopold, "The Miracles of Jesus (I): Preliminary Survey." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 1 (1971):59-80.

________. "Hellenistic and Rabbinic 'Miracles.'" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 2 (1972):281-307.

________. "The Miracles of Jesus (II): Jesus and the Evil Powers." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 4 (1974):115-75.

Samain, E. "La notion de ARCHĒ dans l'oeuvre lucanienne." In Neirynck, F., ed. *L'Évangile de Luc.*

Schmitt, J. "L'église de Jerusalem, ou la 'restauration' d'Israel." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 27 (1953):209-18.

XUM

Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1954. Pp. 165-86.

Smalley, S. S. "Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer in Luke-Acts." Novum Testamentum 15 (1973):59-71.

Smith, Morton. "Prologomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus." Journal of Biblical Literature 90(1971):174-99.

Stanley, D. M. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and Its Transformation by St. Paul." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16 (1954):385-425.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. "Das Tor des Nikanor." Zeitschrift für die neuestestamentliche Wissenschaft 44 (1952-53):44-66.

Talbert, Charles H. "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian" in Bornkamm et al., Jesus and Man's Hope, Vol. I. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970. Pp. 171-222.

________. Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.

Tiede, David L. The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker. SBL Dissertation Series, 1. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Topel, L. John. "Acquittal: A Redaction-Critical Study of Lk 12:57-59." Ph. D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1973.

Unnik, W. C. van. "The 'Book of Acts' the Confirmation of the Gospel," Nov. Test., 4 (1960):26-59.

________. "Elements artistique dans l'évangile de Luc." Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses 46 (1970): 401-12.

________. "Jesus the Christ." New Testament Studies 8 (1961):101-116.

XUM

________. "L'usage de *sōzein*, 'sauver,' et ses dérivés dans les évangiles synoptiques," in *La Formation des Evangiles*. Recherches Bibliques, 2. 1957. Pp. 178-94.

Vawter, Bruce. *This Man Jesus: An Essay toward a New Testament Christology*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1973.

Voss, G. *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen*. Studia Neotestamentica, 2. Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1965.

Weisenberg, E. "The Nicaner Date." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 3 (1952):14-29.

Weiss, Johannes. *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963. 2nd ed.

Wilcox, Max. *The Semitisms of Acts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Wilson, Stephen G. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Zehnle, R. F. *Peter's Pentecost Discourse*. SBL Monograph, 15. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.

Zingg, Paul. *Das Wachsen der Kirche: Beiträge zur Frage der lukanischen Redaktion und Theologie*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 3. Freiburg/Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1974.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR

Michael Dennis Hamm, S.J., was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, January 18, 1936. He grew up in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, attending St. Robert's parochial school (1942-50), Marquette High School (1950-54), and Marquette University (1954-58), graduating with a B.A. in English.

After entering the Society of Jesus (Wisconsin Province) in the fall of 1958, he pursued his religious and further academic training at Sacred Heart Novitiate, Los Gatos, California (1958-60), Jesuit College, St. Bonifacius, Minnesota (1960-61), and St. Louis University (1961-64), graduating in 1964 with a M.A. in English and a Ph.L.

He taught English Literature in Omaha, Nebraska, first at Creighton Preparatory School (1964-65) and then at Creighton University (1965-67). During 1967-70, he did theological studies for the priesthood at St. Louis University School of Divinity, receiving a M.A. in Biblical Languages and Literature in January, 1970.

He was ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood, June 10, 1970.

His graduate studies in Biblical Languages and Literature at St. Louis University (1968-75) were supplemented by a travel fellowship with Hebrew Union College in Israel (summer, 1970) and a research fellowship at Yale Divinity School (1973-74).

At present he is teaching as Assistant Professor, Department of Theology, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska.

XUM